HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, May 27, 1970*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

With the Lord is strength and wisdom.—Job 12: 16.

Dear Lord and Father of us all, as the quiet splendor of a new day dawns upon us we look up to Thee seeking the guidance of Thy spirit, the goodness of Thy presence and the greatness of Thy power. In the heat and burden of this day let not our spirits fail, our steps falter nor our strength fade. Help us to stand visibly and vitally for what is right and just and good.

Bless our beloved Speaker and his wife, Harriet. We thank Thee for his long and faithful service in this body and for his wise and sound leadership as the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Grant unto this wonderful couple health and strength for years to come.

Keep in our hearts the loving remembrance of those who across the years have given their lives for our country and for those who even now are giving their lives or have become prisoners of war that we may be one nation under Thee with liberty and justice for all.

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 concurrent resolution of the House, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 646

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Wednesday, May 27, 1970, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, June 1, 1970.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 12941. An act to authorize the release of four million one hundred eighty thousand pounds of cadmium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 15021. An act to authorize the release of forty million two hundred thousand pounds of cobalt from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 15831. An act to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 15832. An act to authorize the disposal of castor oil from the national stockpile;

H.R. 15833. An act to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 15835. An act to authorize the disposal of magnesium from the national stockpile;

H.R. 15836. An act to authorize the disposal of type A, chemical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 15837. An act to authorize the disposal of type B, chemical grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 15838. An act to authorize the disposal of shellac from the national stockpile;

H.R. 15839. An act to authorize the disposal of tungsten from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 15998. An act to authorize the disposal of Surinam-type metallurgical grade bauxite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 16289. An act to authorize the disposal of natural Ceylon amorphous lump graphite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 16290. An act to authorize the disposal of refractory grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 16291. An act to authorize the disposal of chrysotile asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 16292. An act to authorize the disposal of corundum from the national stockpile;

H.R. 16295. An act to authorize the disposal of natural battery grade manganese ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; and

H.R. 16297. An act to authorize the disposal of molybdenum from the national stockpile.

Agrees to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CANNON, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, and Mr. SCHWEIKER to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 14685, AMENDING INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL ACT

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 14685) to amend the International Travel Act of 1961, as amended, in order to improve the balance of payments by further promoting travel to the United States, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STAGGERS, MOSS, MURPHY of New York, SPRINGER, and CUNNINGHAM.

EXTENDING PROVISIONS OF U.S. FISHING FLEET IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4813) to extend the provisions of the U.S. Fishing Fleet Improvement Act, as amended, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 6, line 24, strike out "1970 and 1971" and insert "1970, 1971, and 1972".

Page 7, line 6, strike out "'1971'." and insert "'1972'."

Page 7, strike out all after line 6 over to and including line 6 on page 8.

Page 8, line 7, strike out "10." and insert "9".

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIVISION OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if I had a hot anvil handy, I most certainly would strike it. The time has come for action.

My reference is to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which in the truest sense is surely a "can of worms."

At a time when the budget of HEW is about to surpass that of the Department of Defense, according to my information, they have apparently "thrown the wrong baby out of the window," by accepting the resignation of actuary "Bob" Myers, a "sound dollar" man, and retaining an "expansionist," Bob Ball in the driver's seat of Commissioner of Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, the platform of my party, formed during the convention of 1968, called for a division of HEW into three manageable departments. In fact, my colleague, CLARENCE BROWN, JR., has already submitted proposed legislation to remove the Department of Health and make it a separate entity.

Mr. Speaker, my question is this, would it not be more manageable to have three smaller "cans of worms," instead of the one "huge can," that seems to have turned into a situation that would make Zeus, creator of "Pandora" look like a sure bet to become a future appointee to that department?

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. 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. 144]

Alexander	Blackburn	Cabell
Anderson, Tenn.	Blanton	Carter
	Blatnik	Celler
Baring	Bolling	Chisholm
Berry	Brown, Mich.	Clark
Biester	Burton, Calif.	Clawson, Del

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Clay	Hansen, Idaho	Reifel
Cohelan	Hébert	Riegle
Conyers	Hogan	Roberts
Cowger	Hungate	Rodino
Cramer	Jarman	Roe
Culver	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Colo.
Cunningham	Jones, Tenn.	Rogers, Fla.
Daddario	Kirwan	Rooney, N.Y.
Dawson	Kyl	Roybal
de la Garza	Landrum	Ruppe
Dowdy	McCarthy	Sandman
Dulski	McCulloch	Saylor
Dwyer	McMillan	Scherle
Eckhardt	MacGregor	Scheuer
Edwards, Calif.	Mathias	Schwengel
Edwards, La.	Matsunaga	Sebelius
Evans, Colo.	May	Smith, Iowa
Evins, Tenn.	Mikva	Snyder
Feighan	Miller, Calif.	Stubblefield
Foley	Nichols	Stuckey
Ford,	O'Neal, Ga.	Teague, Tex.
William D.	Ottinger	Tunney
Gallagher	Patten	Watson
Gaydos	Pepper	Watts
Gilbert	Pettis	Whitten
Goldwater	Pollock	Wilson,
Gray	Powell	Charles H.
Green, Oreg.	Railsback	Winn
Green, Pa.	Randall	
Griffiths	Rees	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 326 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I shall always cherish my friendship with the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, for he has been both a true friend and a dedicated leader of this Chamber. The announcement this past week of his plans to retire from the Congress at the end of this session brought to all of us the sudden realization that this career of public service has been unlike few others in history. This was fully acknowledged at last evening's farewell reception to Speaker MCCORMACK, attended by President Nixon, President and Mrs. Johnson, and Members of the House and Senate.

This gentleman has given his life to the people of his country for no other reason that his desire to serve and improve his land. He has given of himself because he sincerely desired to help those of us who serve in the House today. We owe him a debt of gratitude which can never be repaid.

The career of the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK will receive special attention as historians look back on his achievements and decisions. The Speaker is a man of honor whose wisdom and dedication to our service is without parallel. I wish he and his charming wife years of happiness and I hope that he will remain in close touch with his friends and admirers in the Congress.

RALPH GINZBURG

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr Speaker, I read in this morning's paper that Ralph Ginzburg, the now infamous New York publisher of Eros and other pornographic materials, has had his sentence for conviction of mailing such matter reduced from 5 years imprisonment to 3 years.

It is interesting to note that Ginzburg is still free on bail because of endless appeals of the sentence which was imposed 7 years ago. His attorney was arguing for a suspended sentence on the grounds that people have changed in the last 7 years, considering Woodstock, parading nudes, and sexually integrated college dorms.

The U.S. District Judge, E. MacTroutman, should be real proud that he thinks he is performing a public service by listening to such an absurd argument. At a time when people around the nation are pleading for more stringent curbs on the dissemination of obscene literature and when Congress is in fact actively working on such legislation, it is absolutely indefensible that Judge MacTroutman should take it upon himself to lessen the penalty of a crime for which Ginzburg was duly tried, convicted, and sentenced. The passage of time, if anything, has made the activities of Ginzburg even more deplorable and Judge MacTroutman's action is a mockery of justice which is a prime example of the permissiveness with which many of our learned judges seem to be possessed regardless of society's sanctions.

Perhaps if Ginzburg can perpetuate his appeals and if we have a few more Woodstocks along with a further degradation of this country's moral fiber on which Ginzburg and his attorney are eminently qualified to speak, maybe he will wind up with a sack of lollipops and a firm handshake for contributing to the literary genius of our people.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 17755) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, and to include pertinent material.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1971

Mr. BOLAND. 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. 17755) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLYNT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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. 17755, with Mr. EDMONDSON 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 Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

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

Mr. Chairman, this is the fourth annual Department of Transportation appropriation bill to be brought before the committee. I believe, having watched the Department mature over the past 3 years, that it is doing a good job. It is a difficult task to bring a group of formerly independent agencies together and have them work cohesively toward common objectives. I believe that this is now being accomplished and that the result will be an improved transportation system throughout the country.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies, I want to express my appreciation to the members of the committee for their cooperation and industry during the detailed hearings on this bill—the gentleman from California (Mr. MCFALL); the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES); the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED); the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE); the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL); and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS).

Although a few items in the bill have received considerably more publicity than others, the committee gave an appropriate amount of attention to all items, as is shown by the 3,000 pages of printed testimony received on the bill. In two instances—the Coast Guard Reserve and ICC—after considering all pertinent factors, the committee is recommending appropriations above those provided for in the budget. For the most part, however, reductions are recommended.

We recommend the appropriation of $7,052,157,000 for the transportation programs financed in the bill now before us. Of this amount approximately $4.5 billion is liquidating cash and about $2.6 billion is new obligational authority. The reduction recommended below the budget is $112,806,000.

We are, however, faced with increasing transportation requirements. As our population and our economy grow, so do our transportation needs. There is a need for more transportation. There is a need for safer transportation. And there is a need for faster transportation. So, this bill would provide $379,808,000 more than

has been appropriated for fiscal year 1970 for similar activities.

The bill provides funds for over 114,000 positions, including approximately 75,000 civilian personnel and 39,000 military personnel for the U.S. Coast Guard. This is an increase of about 5,000 civilian and 700 military personnel over the current fiscal year. These increases are almost exclusively related to the need for increased safety in all modes of transportation. The committee has denied increases for military and civilian personnel totaling about 1,100 positions. This was partially offset by the addition of personnel in certain areas, but a net reduction of about 600 positions is recommended.

I would call the attention of the members of the committee to the summary of major recommendations beginning on page 4 of the report. These actions are as follows:

First. The appropriation of the $289,965,000 for the continued development of a civil supersonic transport aircraft;

Second. The appropriation of the full budget request for the operations of the FAA, including 2,265 new air traffic control personnel;

Third. The addition of $7.5 million above the budget to provide for the continuation of the Coast Guard selected reserve at a level of 10,000 personnel;

Fourth. A reduction of $7.5 million in the transportation planning, research, and development program in the Office of the Secretary;

Fifth. Approval of the $59 million requested under acquisition, construction, and improvements for the Coast Guard's icebreaker replacement program;

Sixth. A reduction of $7 million in construction, national capital airports based on the deferral of funds for expansion of Dulles terminal building;

Seventh. A reduction of $12,640,000 in the traffic and highway safety appropriation of the National Highway Safety Bureau;

Eighth. The addition of $1,400,000 and 140 positions over the budget for the Interstate Commerce Commission;

Ninth. Provision of the full $180,028,000 fiscal year 1971 request and $150 million of the $188,011,000 requested for fiscal year 1972 for the Federal share of the subway system in Washington, D.C.;

Tenth. A general provision limiting commitments for urban mass transportation grants to $214 million;

Eleventh. A general provision limiting commitments for grants-in-aid for airport development to $220 million.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Mr. Chairman, the request for salaries and expenses for the Office of the Secretary was $19.5 million and we recommend $17.2 million, a reduction of about $2.3 million. The amount recommended is sufficient to provide for 232 additional positions under this appropriation. Of this increase, 172 are counterpart transfers from the operating administrations in the Department. The committee thoroughly examined the rationale for the proposed consolidations of the internal audit, public information, and congressional relations functions, and virtually all of these transfers have been approved. I believe, as do a majority of the committee, that these consolidations should create a more cohesive Department in which all organizational components are working toward common objectives rather than competing against one another.

The bill provides $14.5 million for transportation planning, research and development in the Office of the Secretary. This is a reduction of $7.5 million below the budget, but provides for a $3.5 million increase for the air traffic capacity research program. This program is longer term in nature than the research being conducted by the FAA on the implementation of the so-called NAS and ARTS systems. The committee believes that it is entirely proper to strive for a higher order of automation in the air traffic control system.

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS CENTER (TSC)

I am pleased to report that the Department's new Transportation Systems Center in Cambridge, Mass., will commence operations on July 1, 1970. This center, which has been taken over from NASA, will provide the necessary technical base for much needed improvement in our Nation's transportation system. I am confident that the skill and expertise which will be developed within this center will be of great long-term benefit to the Nation.

With the rapid increases in demand for transportation service, we are faced with mounting congestion in our airways, highways, and urban systems. The application of advanced technology can provide answers to these serious problems. The Department of Transportation, since its formation, has been hindered by the lack of a central technical staff to address total, intermodal transportation research and development. The new Transportation Systems Center will provide the Department with this capability and do so with no increase in the amount of funding requested for fiscal year 1971. The Department will be able to strengthen its in-house R. & D. activities with a highly capable technical team made up of many of the NASA personnel formerly at the Electronics Research Center, plus additional transportation systems experts.

The location of the center on a highly desirable site in Cambridge, at one end of the most densely populated urban corridor in the country, brings an additional benefit to us all. Through its close association with local university and industrial organizations and this urban setting, the center will provide the unique capability to function as an urban transportation systems laboratory which can be used to specifically address our urban congestion problem.

I look forward to the development of this new DOT facility and the major part it will play in strengthening our total transportation research effort.

No funds are recommended for a proposed new program which would provide grants to State agencies to carry out a State natural gas pipeline safety program.

The bill does include the full budget request of $4,845,000 for the consolidation of the departmental headquarters into the Nassif Building in southwest Washington. This is primarily for the first full-year rental cost of the new building, and includes $595,000 for Department of Transportation employee parking.

Mr. Chairman, the bill includes the budget request of $289,965,000 for the SST. This is a very controversial program. It is also one which receives considerable scrutiny, both in the executive branch and in the Congress. This has been true every year since 1963. And every year since 1963, every President and every Congress have voted to continue the program.

To halt the program at this time would mean not only the loss of all $708 million appropriated to date plus approximately $60 million in termination costs, but it would also signify a stopping of aviation progress in this country. There are those who would have us stop aviation progress both in this country and in the rest of the free world by banning supersonic transportation. Mr. Chairman, I don't think the world's greatest technological country should attempt to stop such progress. We should not voluntarily relinquish our world leadership in one of the few remaining industries in which we enjoy a favorable world trade balance. Supersonic transports will be built—three countries are already flying prototypes. Time is now moving in their favor. It has been reported that the British and French may be planning for a second generation Concorde with a 200-passenger capacity to be operational in 1975, and Germany may join them in this endeavor by providing the extra financial assistance needed for this model. Mr. Chairman, if American-owned airlines cannot buy American SST's, they will buy foreign-built SST's.

Concern has been expressed about the possible adverse effects the SST might have on the environment. These are not new issues. The Federal Aviation Administration and other Government agencies have been studying the environmental aspects of this program for more than 6 years, and the results of these studies have significantly influenced the design of the SST. Smokeless engines, improved noise suppression devices, and incorporation of a fixed horizontal stabilizer to provide high lift performance for community noise reduction are only some examples of this design influence.

It has been claimed that the SST sideline noise will be equal to 50 jumbo jets taking off simultaneously. This startling comparison results from use of a nonaccepted noise-measuring standard. The SST has a different distribution of noise than our present subsonic aircraft. Although it may produce relatively higher noise levels at the airport during its takeoff roll, it will produce considerably less noise over the community during takeoff and landing.

Mr. Chairman, the Department has issued a rule that will insure that no SST's—ours or foreign—will fly supersonically across the United States and boom our populace. Despite such continued assurances, there are still those who raise this issue. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is inconceivable to imply that

the independent, articulate voting population of this great Nation is so powerless that such an intrusion would ever be permitted.

It has been alleged that the SST might cause a modification in the world's climate. Such allegations simply are not supported by fact. Even those who make such claims, indicate that they are merely speculative. On the other hand, the Environmental Science Services Administration, an organization which has access to the entire meteorological scientific community, sees no reason to believe that the SST will adversely affect the atmosphere. Mr. Chairman, ESSA is an organization which I believe can best "sift wheat from chaff" and render qualified and unbiased opinions.

There are also those who imply that the SST program specifications have been relaxed and the SST will not be a viable aircraft. This is not so. The production SST must have good economics, meet the FAA certification requirements, and operate on major international airports when introduced. Department of Transportation studies, to date, indicate that the production SST will be viable, will be certificated, and will meet airport requirements.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has reviewed this program in considerable detail. Over 200 pages of our hearings are concerned solely with the SST program. It is the view of the majority of the committee that any technological problems can be overcome and that the program will be successful.

COAST GUARD

The Coast Guard is one of the oldest and finest organizations in our Government, having served this country in peace and war for 180 years. It traditionally has a lean, tight budget and the committee's $3,240,000 reduction for operating expenses is less than one percent below the budget.

Although we have approved the consolidation of most public information and congressional relations functions into the Office of the Secretary, we have not approved the transfer of these functions from the Coast Guard. Because of the high volume of inquiries concerning the whereabouts, status, and well-being of the thousands of young men in uniform, we felt it essential for the Members to have as direct and rapid an access to the top level of management in the Coast Guard as we do with each of the other Armed Services.

The acquisition, construction, and improvements request of the Coast Guard was for $100 million. We recommend the appropriation of $90 million, which, along with the unobligated funds under this program, should be sufficient to cover all obligations estimated for fiscal year 1971. More than half of this request is for a new polar icebreaker, which will initiate the Coast Guard's plan to replace its six World War II "wind-class" ships with four new icebreakers. This has been approved.

As most of you know, the budget proposed to phase out the Coast Guard Selected Reserve training program by the end of fiscal year 1971. The committee has examined this program in considerable detail over the past 2 years. While it cannot be denied that there are arguments for the elimination of the Selected Reserve component of the Coast Guard, we do not feel it has been demonstrated that the port security requirements of the Reserve are either unessential or can be fulfilled by other means. There is presently no other armed service prepared to meet the port security defense requirement in the early days of a mobilization.

Accordingly, we are recommending an appropriation of $17.5 million for the Coast Guard Reserve. This is an increase of $7.5 million over the budget request and a decrease of $8.4 million from fiscal year 1970 appropriations. The amount recommended will provide for a 10,000-man Reserve, a reduction of 5,000 below fiscal year 1970. With this reduced level it should be possible for the Coast Guard to upgrade its Reserve training program and improve the quality of personnel retained. A 10,000-man Reserve should enable the Coast Guard to meet its most urgent needs in protecting the major port areas of the country in the early days of a mobilization, as well as providing a nucleus for peacetime utilization along with the regular Coast Guard in times of natural disasters or national emergencies.

The bill includes $19.5 million for the research, development, test, and evaluation program of the Coast Guard. The largest portion of this amount is for the continuation of the National Data Buoy Development project. This project involves the development and deployment of unmanned ocean data buoys in the Gulf of Mexico.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

The committee recommends the full amount of the budget estimate for operations of the Federal Aviation Administration, $923,885,000. This will provide for 4,361 new positions, of which 2,265 are air traffic control personnel. With this increase, the Congress will have provided 9,496 new air traffic control personnel since the Department was established. This represents a virtual doubling of the controller work force. It is the judgment of this committee—and I am sure this view is shared by other Members of the Congress—that FAA should be provided with the personnel and funds needed to maintain the highest possible degree of safety in the air.

The committee spent a considerable amount of time on the recent problems which FAA has had with some of its air controllers. We heard testimony from the Administrator, the Secretary, and a number of air traffic controllers, some of whom had participated in the latest strike. I feel the Administrator has done an excellent job in handling this very difficult situation.

The committee has been concerned for a number of years about problems of safely controlling air traffic during the prime travel hours in the morning and evening. At some airports large numbers of departures and arrivals are scheduled at the same time. We believe that this adds significantly to the problems in air traffic control and is a major cause of stress on the controllers who work in these congested areas. We have, therefore, requested that the Department, in close collaboration with the Civil Aeronautics Board, undertake a thorough study of this problem.

In the area of facilities and equipment, the committee recommends the full budget request of $190 million. With the recent enactment of the airport and airways user charge legislation, additional funds should become available for this program. A total of $90 million had been withheld by the Bureau of the Budget pending enactment of this legislation.

For research and development we recommend $45 million. This is about a 10-percent increase over the amount provided in fiscal year 1970.

With respect to the National Capital Airports, the committee recommends $10.5 million for operation and maintenance and $4 million for construction. Under our recommendation, the $7 million requested to begin the expansion of the Dulles terminal building would be deferred. We provided $500,000 for the design contract in fiscal year 1970. This contract has not yet been awarded. However, if the contract is awarded and if the design work is completed during fiscal 1971, the necessary excavating and grading could be started with existing unobligated funds.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

For the Office of the Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, we recommend a total of $15,221,000, a reduction of $260,000 below the budget. The budget had proposed to merge this appropriation into the funds requested for the two operating bureaus. We established this separate appropriation last year to facilitate congressional scrutiny over this office and do not concur with the proposal to eliminate it at this time.

A total reduction of $9,425,000 is recommended for the Bureau of Public Roads, of which $5 million is in the new comprehensive corridor transportation program. This program is just getting started and we feel that the funds allowed will enable this program to proceed at a reasonable rate. We also disallowed all funds requested for the continuation of the research for the electronic route guidance system. This is a costly program for which very few meaningful benefits were cited during the hearings.

Mr. Chairman, the largest single item in the bill is a $4,350,340,000 liquidating cash appropriation for the highway trust fund. No reduction is being recommended in the construction program. Highways provide by far the largest portion of the transportion services used in this country. Nearly 98 percent of all urban travel and 88 percent of intercity travel is by highway vehicles.

The committee recommends the budget estimate of $35 million for the right-of-way revolving fund. These funds will permit the acquisition of rights-of-way several years in advance of actual construction, thereby reducing potential inflationary pressures on property costs.

Under highway beautification, we recommend a $16.5 million liquidating cash appropriation. This is a reduction of $3.5 million from the budget request. The bill also includes $500,000 for administration of this program.

For the Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety, we would provide $3,443,000, a decrease of $675,000 from the budget, but a $1.1 million increase over fiscal year 1970. Of this increase, $400,000 is to initiate a contract research and development program. Although the committee generally does not favor initiating new research programs in times of fiscal stringency, we feel that the commercial vehicle and driver regulation areas, to which this effort will be directed, should be given a higher priority than they have been accorded heretofore.

The committee recommends appropriations of $15 million for forest highways and $13 million for public lands highways. As in past years, we have recommended limitations on obligations for these programs. The limitations recommended are $22.5 million for forest highways and $10 million for public lands highways.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY SAFETY BUREAU

The National Highway Safety Bureau has recently been elevated to an independent operating status within the Department. The bill includes an appropriation of $40,435,000 plus the transfer of $2,611,000 for the operating expenses of this Bureau. This is a reduction of $12,640,000 below the budget.

Of the sum recommended, $29 million is for the Bureau's contract program. This is a significant increase over fiscal year 1970 and should allow certain major research efforts such as the air bag and the experimental safety vehicle to proceed at the rate proposed in the budget.

The other activity under this Bureau is State and community highway safety. We recommend a $51 million appropriation for this matching grant program. We are concerned about the lack of State participation in this program, which was designed to encourage and assist the States to create new highway safety projects.

This is not being accomplished. The Director testified that certain Governors indicated that there are no funds available in the States to create new programs. We do not feel, however, that the fiscal situation is any more critical at the State level than at the Federal level and believe that the present accident rate on our Nation's highways is sufficiently urgent to warrant support of new efforts at all levels of government.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

For the Federal Railroad Administration, Office of the Administrator, we recommend a $345,000 increase over fiscal year 1970. This will provide for 12 new positions plus the transfer of six positions from the Federal Highway Administration. The bill also includes appropriations of $4.5 million for the Bureau of Railroad Safety and $900,000 for railroad research.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

The bill provides $3.2 million for the administration of the urban mass transportation program, an increase of more than 100 percent over fiscal year 1970.

No appropriation is included for urban mass transportation grants. In our fiscal year 1970 bill we provided an advance appropriation of $214 million for this program for fiscal year 1971. The pending legislative authorization to extend the program beyond 1971 has not been enacted. That legislation as passed by the other body includes multiyear contractual authority which would allow the commitment of up to $3.1 billion with no prior presentation to the Appropriations Committees of the Congress. This type of provision drastically reduces the congressional control over the program through the appropriations process. Because of this, the committee recommends a provision which would limit the obligations incurred for urban mass transportation grants to $214 million in fiscal year 1971. Such a limitation will enable the Congress through the appropriations process to consider the relative priority of urban transportation along with other programs included in the budget.

RELATED AGENCIES

For the related agencies, $6 million is provided for the National Transportation Safety Board. The committee is impressed by the fine work this Board does in investigating catastrophic or major accidents and has approved six additional positions. We have not approved any increase for the Board's "before the fact" aviation accident prevention program, since virtually all the activities of the FAA are oriented toward aviation safety and accident prevention.

The bill includes the full amounts requested by the Civil Aeronautics Board for operating expenses and payments to air carriers.

For the Interstate Commerce Commission, the committee recommends an increase of $1.4 million over the budget to cover the restoration of 140 positions. It is difficult to see how the Bureau of the Budget and the President could have recommended a lower employment level for the seventh consecutive year in the face of the continuous growth pattern of the surface transportation industry which the ICC regulates. During the past 7 years when the Commission's employment has been declining every year, the regulated industry's revenues received and ton-miles of freight transported have grown by 50 percent.

I feel it would be impossible for the commission to adequately carry out its responsibilities assigned by law if it was not provided with adequate funds and personnel. It is the public who will suffer if the Commission is unable to police household goods shipments, assure adequate transportation service for small businesses and individual shippers, and assure just and reasonable freight rates to the shipping public.

We recommend $330 million for the Federal share of the subway system to serve the National Capital area. This should provide adequate Federal financing to carry the program through fiscal year 1972.

Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege to serve on a subcommittee with such hard-working and knowledgeable colleagues. I wish to commend all of them for the fine work they did. I believe we have performed our duties well and brought a good bill to the committee. It is one which I think all Members can support. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the bill as recommended by the Committee on Appropriations.

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

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BOLAND, for his fine statement.

During the past few months there have been a number of reports of renewed interest on the part of the Port of New York Authority and the Department of Transportation in constructing or extending runways at Kennedy Airport into Jamaica Bay. As the Representative of the Seventh Congressional District of New York in which Kennedy Airport is located, I have vigorously opposed any such extension of runways on several grounds, including the further destruction of the unique recreational resources of Jamaica Bay, air and water pollution, the increase in community noise levels and the increase in air traffic congestion.

In connection with my efforts to block this kind of proposal, I have tried to direct the attention of the appropriate public officials to the urgent need for locating a suitable site for construction of a fourth jetport. The talk of extending Kennedy's runways will play right into the hands of those who want to further delay this urgent task.

I have communicated with Transportation Secretary Volpe and New York City Mayor John V. Lindsay and received assurances of their concern for the protection of the ecological wealth of Jamaica Bay, but my concern continues. The National Academy of Sciences is not conducting a study and public hearings on the proposed expansion of Kennedy Airport. I cannot predict what the outcome of that study will be but I do want to make certain that no action is taken with respect to the expenditure of Federal funds for runway extensions into the Bay until the study is complete and until Congress has had the opportunity to review the study.

With these facts in mind, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) whether there are funds available under this bill for use to construct or extend runways at Kennedy Airport into Jamaica Bay?

Mr. BOLAND. I will say in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from New York (Mr. ADDABBO), that I share the gentleman's concern about the noise situation at Kennedy Airport, and I am conscious of the interest the gentleman has shown in this matter over the years, but insofar as this bill is concerned, there is no money provided for the lengthening of any runways at Kennedy Airport.

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

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that the appropriation in this bill is $16,500,000 for highway beautification?

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman is correct. The amount in this bill for highway beautification is $16.5 million.

Mr. GROSS. While the gentleman is looking for that figure, what have we gotten for the money that has been expended up to this point?

Mr. BOLAND. It is a program, as the gentleman from Iowa knows, that is highly controversial. It is a program that provides for the control of outdoor advertising and junk yards, and for the enhancement of the scenic beauty of the Interstate System.

There is $16.5 million of liquidating cash in this bill to pay for obligations that have already been incurred. This is a reduction of $3.5 million from the budget request. The bill also includes $500,000 for the administration of this program.

The existing authorization for the highway beautification program is approximately $8.5 million. This bill would limit the amount the department can obligate for highway beautification in the fiscal year 1971, to $5 million. So this is actually within the authorization under the basic legislation which establishes the highway beautification program.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad the committee made some reduction. I am surprised that the Bureau of the Budget would ask for the amount that it did. I believe it was in the Department of the Interior appropriation hearings that I read something about flowerbeds along the highways growing up to weeds. Where is the money provided to take care of the weeds in the flowerbeds that have been constructed along the highways? And whose responsibility is it to take care of them?

Mr. BOLAND. Is the gentleman referring to the Interstate System?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I am talking about the highway beautification program under whatever jurisdiction it is.

Mr. BOLAND. As the gentleman knows, some of the highway money is used for enhancing the scenic beauty of the highways.

All of us in this body know the highway beautification program has been of considerable concern to a number of us. It has been described as a program that could cost millions of dollars more if the Congress continues to authorize it.

There has been an effort on the part of the Federal Highway Administration to get additional authorization, but the authorizing committee has not seen fit to report a bill.

Mr. GROSS. If I am going to take a ride to the poor house, I would like to see the roses that have been planted along the roads as a result of the expensive beautification program. If we are going to have a highway beautification program in times like these, when we ought to conserve every dime, then I think we ought to be able to see the roses, the petunias, and whatever else there is, as we take our trip to the poorhouse.

Mr. BOLAND. I would agree with the gentleman. How fine it would be to have on our highways the beauty of the rose that is in the lapel of the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

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

Mr. Chairman, I had a most difficult decision to make this year. As you know, I had to decide whether to remain as the ranking minority member of the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee, on which I have sat for 12 years, or to take up that spot on your distinguished subcommittee.

I chose the latter after long and hard consideration. I have certainly enjoyed working with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) and my other distinguished colleagues on the subcommittee.

The transportation problems of this Nation are great. I think the subcommittee recognizes the job it has to do and that it has been working hard at it.

Improvements are essential if we are to maintain an effective system balanced among air, rail, motor vehicle, and mass transit components. These improvements cost money. This distinguished committee has the responsibility of deciding where that money is best spent and, therefore, where the necessary improvements will be made.

I think the bill before us reflects both the great effort that went into it and the balance that must be struck between improving transportation systems and holding back inflationary spending.

TOTAL BILL

The committee has cut $112.8 million from the total 1971 request and recommended a level of $7.052 billion. This represents an increase of $379.8 million over the appropriation for fiscal 1970.

In title I of the bill, H.R. 17755, the committee cut $45.9 million from the request and recommended $2.169 billion. This is $140.8 million over the appropriation for fiscal 1970. Title I covers the Department of Transportation.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

The committee cut $10.7 million from the request for the Office of the Secretary under title I and recommended $326.5 million. This is $214.4 million over the fiscal 1970 appropriation. The bulk of the increase is attributable to the civil supersonic aircraft development budget which was transferred from the Federal Aviation Administration.

The committee cut $2.2 million from the request for "Salaries and expenses" in the Office of the Secretary and recommended $17.2 million. In so doing, it allowed 232 of 397 new positions divided into two categories. Under the first, counterpart transfers, 172 of 187 have been approved. Under the second, program increases, only 60 of 210 have been approved. As indicated on page 6 of the report, House Report 91–1115, the committee disallowed 165 of the requested positions because it feels, as it did last year, that the number of personnel in OST is becoming excessive.

Under "Transportation planning, research, and development," the committee cut $7.5 million and recommended $14.5 million. This represents a $3.5 million over 1970, all of which is for air traffic capacity research.

In June 1968, the committee directed the Department of Transportation to report on aspects of its scattered and sometimes overlapping research activities. To date this report has not been received. However, the committee still emphasizes the need for the Department to better coordinate and improve the programs in almost all areas of research and technology and it has stated so on page 7 of the report.

The request for $1,000,000 under grants-in-aid for natural gas pipeline safety was denied because the committee felt that these costs are more properly borne by the States. The money would have been used for grants to State agencies.

To consolidate departmental headquarters, the committee approved a request for $4.8 million.

SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT PROGRAM

During the current fiscal year, the SST program was transferred from the Federal Aviation Administration as I have already mentioned. This transfer will remove the direct responsibility for prototype development away from the administration which is directly responsible for the aircraft's certification, thus eliminating possible concern about FAA conflict of interest.

The SST is, of course, the most controversial part of H.R. 17755 just as it was the most controversial part of H.R. 14794 last year. The question of whether to continue with this program and approve the request for $289.9 million for fiscal 1971 is a very complicated one

I have, as I did last year, studied everything I could get my hands on. I read over that which I had studied in preparation for the fiscal 1970 bill and what seemed like all that has been published since that time.

I think good arguments can be made on both sides of the issue. My distinguished colleague from Illinois, Mr. YATES, has done an excellent job pointing out reasons for not going ahead with the SST. On the other hand, the committee report, on pages 8 and 9, explains why we should go ahead.

I know this is going to be an extremely difficult decision because there are so many pros and cons. Therefore, I cannot and will not ask my colleagues to vote either for or against the SST. I have agonized over this for many months, through the hearings and right up to today. I think everyone has to make up his own mind and reach his own decision.

I would, however, point out, as I did during the hearings, some of these pros and cons.

During hearings before the subcommittee, we went into the question of how the SST would affect the environment. The fact of the matter is, at least from everything I have read and heard, that the only serious problem—and it is a problem—is sideline noise. This is the noise that the plane will make while it is on the ground.

I would refer my colleagues to page 590 of the hearings wherein I had the following dialog with Mr. Vierling:

Mr. CONTE. Last year on page 83 Mr. Shaffer said, "SST noise is very serious in this lateral dimension." Then Mr. Shaffer noted it would be very costly to suppress this noise.

Mr. VIERLING. On the airplane?

Mr. CONTE. That is right. Has the FAA done a study of the number of people that will be affected by this sideline noise? Would you not agree that the sideline noise problem is serious enough to merit some real efforts in noise suppression, regardless of their cost? What have you done since you last appeared before this committee to attack the sideline noise problem, if anything?

Mr. VIERLING. Mr. Conte, we have continued our efforts to reduce the total noise level of the engine. * * * We have done a great deal, but we cannot tell you that we have made a great breakthrough on noise.

Sideline noise is a serious problem. However, we have been assured that it will be solved and that by the time the SST is ready to fly it will meet the new FAA noise standards.

I might add that the noise on takeoff and landing will be less than it is on current aircraft because the SST will get up and down faster with its more powerful engines.

There will be no sonic boom over land because the SST will not fly at supersonic speeds over land areas.

This brings me to the question of economics and whether, in these days of very tight money and an unbalanced budget, such an expenditure should be made.

I might point out, at the outset, that a $76 million cost overrun was brought out at page 517 of the hearings as a result of my questioning. I say that because I want the record clear about my concern over the cost of the program. The Government will bear the burden of $57 million of that $76 million overrun. Therefore, at the end of fiscal 1971 and assuming approval of the pending request, the Government will have obligated approximately $998 million of the now total $1.342 billion estimated through phase III.

If the SST program were terminated, I think my colleagues should know the economic consequences.

The Federal Government would lose the $2.3 billion anticipated in royalties upon sale of the 500th plane, of which $1 billion would be profit.

The Government would also lose $790.4 million consisting of $708 million already appropriated, $60 million in closing cost requirements, and $22.4 million of airline advanced royalty payments.

The airlines would lose their $58.5 million in risk capital.

The contractors would have to lay off 4,500 people directly. This would affect another 2,500 indirectly, and the subsequent tiered effect on subcontractors throughout the country could hit from 7,000 to 10,000 skilled aerospace workers.

The United States would suffer an adverse effect on our balance of payments during the 1980–90 period of approximately $16 billion.

The United States would also lose its No. 1 position in the aviation field. Dropping the SST now would deny the country the opportunity to commercially exploit the 20 years of supersonic design and advanced technological development financed by the Government. Foreign nations could, through proper marketing, force the U.S.-made medium long-range subsonic jets out of the future market. We would lose a focal point for advanced aeronautics in this country. The effect of all this on the aviation industry and the overall economy should be carefully considered.

Based on the pros and cons that I have just outlined, I believe each member will have to search his own conscience and determine whether to go ahead with the SST or to discontinue the program.

U.S. COAST GUARD

Turning now to the U.S. Coast Guard, the committee cut $10.2 million from the total request and recommended $614.9 million.

The committee cut $3.2 million from the request for Coast Guard operating expenses and recommended $423.5 million. The cut is based primarily on the Vietnamization program, including savings of 100 man-years from turning over two cutters to Vietnamese Navy personnel. The total cost of operations in Southeast Asia in fiscal 1970 is estimated at $16.5 million.

The committee has also cut $10 million from acquisition, construction, and improvements. This cut will not affect the icebreaker replacement program for which $59 million has been approved to construct a new polar icebreaker.

No cut was made from the request of $64.5 million for retired pay.

RESERVE TRAINING

The budget proposes to phase out the Coast Guard Selected Reserve training program by June 30, 1971. The proposal contemplates that the emergency wartime functions of the Selected Reserve can reasonably be handled by the growing number of regular Coast Guardsmen on the retired rolls and enlistees who are required to serve in a standby status for 2 years after completing 4 years active service.

The committee does not concur with this proposal. It has therefore recommended $17.5 million, which is $7.5 million more than the budget request, and called for a force of 10,000 in the Selected Reserve by October 1, 1970. In its fiscal 1970 report, the committee called for a level of 15,000 by June 30, 1970.

At this point, it might be good to explain the difference between the Ready Reserve and Selected Reserve. The commandant, Adm. Willard J. Smith, testified:

The Ready Reserve is the total number of people that we have available for call-up within a reasonable period of time. For example, our Ready Reserve is set at about 24,000. Of that 24,000, about 17,000 are Selected Reservists. The Selected Reserve is part of your total Ready Reserve.

* * * * *

The Selected Reserve are in a drill pay status and they attend drills every week, 48 drills a year, and they are also required to have 2 weeks active duty for training each year.

During hearings before the subcommittee, we took a very hard look at the Selected Reserve program. We concluded, after lengthy study, that there remained a need for this program particularly in the field of port security.

I would direct my colleagues' attention to page 10 of the report where the committee stated:

While there are arguments for the elimination of the Selected Reserve component of the Coast Guard, the committee feels that it has not been demonstrated that this Reserve's basic mobilization requirements, particularly in the field of port security, can satisfactorily be fulfilled as proposed in the budget. There is presently no other Armed Service prepared to meet the port security defense requirement in the early days of a mobilization.

I think a force level of 10,000 should enable the Selected Reserve to adequately handle the job of port security. The smaller force level should improve the quality of the Selected Reserve. It will be far easier to manage and train than a larger force and at the same time it will fit the bill called for in the area of port security.

I disagree with the proposal to phase out of the Selected Reserve. I do, however, strongly support the committee's action to reduce this force in size and thereby increase its efficiency and its ability to meet the jobs it has to do.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

The committee cut $9.6 million from the total FAA request and recommended $1.17 billion.

No cut was made from the request of $923.8 million for operating expenses. This represents a $98.2 million increase over the proposed 1970 funding level. The increase provides for 4,361 new positions, of which 2,265 are air traffic control personnel. Including this increase, the committee will have provided 9,496 air traffic control operations personnel since the Department of Transportation was established. This represents a virtual doubling of the controller work force.

No cut was made from the request of $190 million for "Facilities and equipment." However, this is $34 million below the 1970 level. On May 21, 1970, President Nixon signed the airport/airways bill into law. It is expected that the Bureau of the Budget will release $90 million in fiscal 1970 funds appropriated by this committee but frozen, pending passage of that legislation, for facilities and equipment. It is also expected that there will be a $60 million supplemental report following recent enactment of the airport bill.

The committee denied 135 new positions requested for facilities and equipment and the funds for these positions can be applied to the purchase of needed equipment. There are presently 1,243 funded under this appropriation to install new equipment. Installation can be provided for in the procurement contract and thereby eliminate the need for additional personnel.

The committee cut $2.5 million from the request for research and development and recommended $45 million.

The committee cut $100,000 from operations and maintenance of the National Capital airports and recommended $10.5 million. It is estimated that National Airport will show a net income of $2.7 million in 1971 and that Dulles will show a net loss of $5.2 million. Interest and depreciation total $7.3 million and are detailed as a result of my questioning on page 463.

The committee cut $7 million from construction for the National Capital airports and recommended $4 million. The expansion of the Dulles terminal building would be deferred for 1 year.

During the hearings, we looked very closely into the problems of the air traffic control system. I specifically asked about the Corson Committee Report, and the FAA Administrator, Mr. Shaffer, replied that he has established nine different action groups and has already begun implementation of some of the report's recommendations.

The need for more controllers and better equipment has been recognized by the committee. The problem of peak-hour scheduling has also been recognized, and the committee has requested the Department to study the matter in close collaboration with the CAB and report its findings no later than February 1, 1971.

The growth in aviation has been great, even over the past year. Revenue passenger miles will jump from 130.2 billion in 1970 to 141.3 billion in 1971. Landings and takeoffs at airports with FAA towers will jump from 55.7 million to 58.7 million during the same 2 years. Instrument operations at airports with FAA traffic-control service will jump from 18 million to 19.2 million.

The challenges in this field are equally great. The new Cambridge NASA Center, which is now under the Department of Transportation, will, according to the Administrator, "provide an invaluable resource which can and will be employed by the FAA in a variety of its R. & D. efforts, particularly on advanced systems development."

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

The committee cut $1 million from the total request for the Federal Highway Administration and recommended $4.4 million in funds from the General Treasury. As my colleagues know, the bulk of this appropriation is out of trust funds, in liquidation of contract authorization, or as a limitation on obligations.

Under salaries and expenses for the Office of the Administrator, the committee cut $25,000 from appropriations and $235,000 from trust funds. The recommendation is $500,000 and $14.7 million, respectively.

The committee cut $9.4 million from the limitation on general expenses for the Bureau of Public Roads and recommended $68.4 million. Among other things, the comprehensive corridor project was cut from $10 million to $5 million and funds to continue electronic route guidance system research have been denied.

The committee cut $9.6 million from the trust fund for Federal-aid highways and recommended $4.35 billion. The cut is due to a reduction in administrative expenses.

No cut was made from the $35 million request out of the trust fund for liquidation of contract authorization by the right-of-way revolving fund. This money is for the advance acquisition of rights-of-way and payments for relocation expenses by the States.

The committee cut $3.5 million from highway beautification for liquidation of contract authorization and recommended $16.5 million.

The committee cut $675,000 from motor carrier safety and recommended $3.4 million. In so doing, it approved 12 of 32 new position requested.

Cuts of $5 million and $2 million were made in forest highways and public lands highways, respectively.

As many of my colleagues know, I also sit on the Migratory Bird Commission. I have been quite disturbed about the construction of highways through wildlife preserves set aside for future generations by the Commission. I made this clear to the Administrator, Mr. Turner, during the hearings, in reference to the Tinicum Wildlife Preserve near Philadelphia. I do not want to see these last bits of wilderness destroyed by highways and I hope my colleagues feel the same way.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY SAFETY BUREAU

The committee cut $12.6 million and recommended $40.4 million for traffic and highway safety under the National Highway Safety Bureau. The emphasis in the research program will be on alcohol countermeasures, an experimental safety vehicle, and air bags. Of 254 new positions requested, 100 were approved.

The committee also cut $10 million from liquidation of contract authorization under the NHSB and recommended $51 million. This is a 50–50 matching program with the States.

The problem of highway safety is an ever-present one. Traffic fatalities reached an all-time high of 56,400 in 1969, an increase of 800 over 1968.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

Under the Federal Railroad Administration, the committee cut $855,000 and recommended a total of $6.7 million.

Included in the overall cut was a cut of $205,000 from salaries and expenses for the Office of the Administrator. The recommendation was $1.3 million and included 12 of 26 new positions requested.

The committee cut $50,000 from the Bureau of Railroad Safety and recommended $4.5 million.

The $21.6 million request for high-speed ground transportation R. & D. was deferred.

The recommendation of $900,000 for railroad research reflects a $600,000 cut.

No appropriation was requested or recommended for the Alaska Railroad.

As I did last year, I talked about declining rail passenger service. The Administrator, Mr. Whitman, acknowledged that "the problem is that some companies, especially in the East where most passenger business is concentrated, are running some pretty terrible passenger service."

I also looked into rail safety questions and how they related to my bill, H.R. 14417, which would give the Secretary more authority in this area.

I might note that passenger volume on through trips between Washington and New York on the Metroliner increased 44 percent in 1969 over 1968. Daily patronage averages 3,750. On-time performance is 86 percent. Since the start of service through February 11, 1970, it has carried 780,000.

URBAN MASS TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

The committee cut $800,000 from the request for salaries and expenses under the Urban Mass Transit Administration and recommended $3.2 million. Of 118 new positions requested, 48 were allowed. This along with the 70 new positions provided in 1970 will give UMTA three times the number of positions they had 2 years ago.

No appropriation was requested for mass transit fund because of new legislation in this area. The committee does not favor granting long-term contractual authority by substantive legislation and has included a $214 million limit for 1971 for this reason.

I let the UMTA people known how I feel about the need to take a close look at its position on "Buy America." Their position has been not to permit "Buy America" provisions in third-party contracts unless they are mandatory under State law. I think this should be watched closely because our domestic industry is being hurt by imports—imports which come from countries with two-price markets, one for domestic consumption and a lower one for export to the United States.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

No cut was made from the $700,000 request for the St. Lawrence Seaway. No new positions had been requested.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

Turning briefly to title II of H.R. 17755, the committee cut $36.7 million and recommended a total of $401.4 million as follows:

It cut $120,000 from the request for the National Transportation Safety Board and recommended $6 million. Of 10 new positions requested, six were allowed. Four are aviation accident investigators and two are surface accident investigators.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

No cut was made from the $11.1 million request for salaries and expenses under the Civil Aeronautics Board. In 1970, the CAB will have 685 positions, only 19 more than it had in 1962. During the same period, revenue ton-miles increased from 6.7 billion to 19.5 billion or about 200 percent.

No cut was made from the $27.3 million request for payments to air carriers. This represents a $6.1 million decrease from 1970.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The committee recommended $1.4 million more than the Interstate Commerce Commission had requested. The committee believes the ICC's effectiveness would have been impaired had it adopted the proposed budget cuts and therefore recommended $27 million.

WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

The committee cut $38 million from the WMTA and recommended $330 million including an advance for 1972. The system has been delayed over a minority hiring problem.

The total system will cost $2.5 billion, two-thirds Federal to one-third local.

CONCLUSION

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to detail the committee bill. It has been a real pleasure serving as the ranking minority member on the transportation subcommittee, and working with my distinguished and able colleagues on it.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, what is the rationale and what is the evidence or what are the statistics, if any, to show the statement being put out by the FAA is true: that the side noises at ground level are going to be very excessive, but the noises on takeoff and landing are going to be less than the present jet subsonic planes?

We know the input of the afterburner noise on the subsonic plane now, and we know there will be substantially more on the SST, so I wonder if my colleague can tell the House where is there any evidence that the statement being made is true, that the noise will be less on takeoff and landing for the SST than for the present subsonic jet? I have heard the statement and it is being broadcast in a telephone message, but I have not seen any evidence to back that statement up.

Mr. CONTE. I would direct the gentleman to our hearings where we had expert testimony from the Department of Transportation and others based on the evidence they have and the engine they have at the present time.

Mr. PUCINSKI. But at best those statements are nothing more than educated guesses. They have absolutely no hard proof.

They have nothing to work with. The best they can give us is a slide rule guess.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Of course, that is the purpose of producing the prototype airplane. The contract of this Government is to assist in financing two prototypes to determine its feasibility.

The evidence presented to our committee clearly indicates that the airport noise occasioned by the SST may be somewhat louder than present subsonic jets.

There was an indication—and it is all supposition on the part of those who say we will not be able to control the noise—that there is no answer to it. The response given by those in the Office of the Supersonic Transport, however, indicates that one can make the land compatible with the aircraft itself. This is a real possibility.

There is testimony in the hearings which indicates that some of the scientists—and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) will refer to one of the most distinguished ones, Dr. Bisplinghoff from MIT—feel that the sideline noise connected with the takeoff is insurmountable. There are others who think it is not.

But the community noise is a lot less than that of the 707. The reason why it is a lot less is because this plane climbs much more rapidly. My understanding is, if I remember the figures correctly, that 3½ miles away from the airport, it is actually much less noisy than the present 707. All of those who are connected with the program say this. All the engineering data to date clearly shows that this aircraft is less noisy after it leaves the airport.

The great concern of most people is community noise. This is the noise that is developed after the plane has left the airport and is gaining altitude.

I am willing to trust the judgment of the Office of the Supersonic Transport and the evaluations of those who have studied the noise program.

There is no evidence which indicates that the SST is more noisy than the present generation of aircraft over the community.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. To further concur with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), the ratio of noise roughly is cut in half every 1,000 feet of altitude. In other words, the width of the cone of noise hitting the ground doubles every 1,000 feet of altitude. The height of the SST climb-up is almost twice as great, about 80 percent greater than the other aircraft, at 1 mile, and it is about the same ratio at 3 miles, according to the slide rules. If we start vetoing things that cannot be proven by slide rules in this House we will have a hard time.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I believe the testimony before the committee sustains what the gentleman from Tennessee said, except that until it reaches that point of climb-out we will have the most infernal racket any airplane has ever made in this country, a racket which is so bad that the airport authorities are not going to permit any of the supersonic planes to land—whether it is the Russian Tupolev, the SST, or the Concorde—they will not be permitted to land at any of the existing American airports. That is why in a recent press release put out by the Department of Transportation we find the statement made that they are going to build new airports, are going to build airports remote from the urban centers, so that the noise will not be a factor.

All that means is that whatever speed is gained in the air will be lost on the ground, in traveling back and forth from the urban centers.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

I am sure before this afternoon is over this will be a most important debate.

Mr. CONTE. I am sure it will take a great deal of time.

Mr. PUCINSKI. It was my privilege to attend the first international conference on jet noise in London in 1965. It was at that time, at that conference, that the legislation we passed here setting certain noise standards was developed. I can tell you then and there there were scientists from all over the world attending this conference. I do not think you can treat the problem of noise as lightly as some Members would like to. I do not think that the FAA can stand behind the statements it is making on the limitation of noise.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. Of course, let me say to the gentleman from Illinois, no one is treating the subject of noise or sonic boom lightly, and the gentleman from Illinois ought to understand that those of us who support this program are concerned about the sonic boom and its effect on the ecology. All of these factors are being considered by those who are developing the plane, and by those who are monitoring this development.

Practically all of the organizations involved in the environment, such as the National Academy of Sciences and the Environmental Science Services Administration, are concerned with noise. There is a real possibility that the noise problem can be conquered by the time this plane is flying. So there is a concern. No one treats it lightly at all, and I do not want any other member of the Committee to get that idea. The record shows that it is not being treated lightly.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. I want to echo what the gentleman from Massachusetts said about the noise problem.

All of us who support this program are concerned about it. What is happening in the United States is a matter of the question that originally all of us will remember—and I would point this out to my colleagues certainly from Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles—that the airports were built a way out because airplanes have always been noisy. However, the people have moved out around them and now are very unhappy about the increased noise. So, we will have to go into a new program of building more airports farther out.

Under the present plans, even the traffic we have now, is going to cause continuing complaints and there is not a Member from an urban district here that is not going to be faced with those complaints.

In our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce we have just passed out a bill providing for $2.5 billion for a new airport program for this very reason. We know we are going to have to go out farther.

I do not know how many Members of the House have actually heard or seen the Concorde fly. I have. I talked to the designer of the Concorde, both the British and the French, and I spent all afternoon with the Tupolev and its designer. But, these airplanes are flying airplanes and they are going to fly.

Each one of your communities is going to have to solve its noise problem on the basis of the transportation you have into your area, because there is going to be a supersonic airplane. Whether your community is either going to have them fly in and out depends on the politics of your area and whether the people want to

move faster or whether they want to hold that noise down.

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

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

Mr. YATES. The gentleman from Washington is entirely wrong on that point. The communities will not be compelled to let the Tupulov and the Concorde——

Mr. ADAMS. I say they will decide whether they will.

Mr. YATES. Of course, they will decide. But let me tell the gentleman that there is now in existence a standard put out by the FAA that restricts prospective noise of supersonic jets to 108 decibels.

Mr. ADAMS. I am well aware of that fact.

Mr. YATES. I am glad that the gentleman is aware of that fact. However, no standard has been issued by FAA yet with respect to supersonic noise.

The question that FAA is going to have to answer is whether or not it is going to permit a greater noise standard for SST's than it does for the 108 level.

What do you think is going to happen when a community which becomes used to a standard is compelled to submit to a noise level of up to 124 decibels, when that community is suddenly confronted with this enormous racket? Of course, they will fight that noise and try to ban the supersonic planes.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield further to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. This is precisely what the communities will have to decide. For example, they will have to decide whether the flights going from London to Paris and across the Atlantic are going to land at Boston, New York or Philadelphia. That decision is going to have to be made in each individual case. The only way you are going to know the noise factor of an American supersonic transport is to have the prototype as the British, the French and the Russians now have.

At the present time I am well acquainted with the Bridge report and others, and they are sheer speculation as to what the total noise factor will be.

Mr. YATES. Why are you willing to accept their findings on approach and takeoff noise, and not on sideways noise?

Mr. ADAMS. I am taking their approach in the same fashion of the noise factor at this point until we see a flyaway airplane, and we can continue to speculate on what it will be. The British and French plane, and that is the Concorde, will fly from Paris, and it will fly from London, and it will land at those communities in the United States that will allow it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, what about the total cost so far? The gentleman made the statement that if we were to abandon this program now and fail to spend this money that we would already suffer some losses that will not be recoverable. Is there a total on that?

Mr. CONTE. Yes; there are $708 million that has already been appropriated. There is also $60 million that I mentioned in closing costs. And finally, there is $22.4 million of airline advanced royalty payments that would have to be returned.

Mr. PUCINSKI. We have talked about the prototype, and I wonder if the gentleman will tell me if we spend this additional $290 million, and whatever other billions it will take to build the two prototypes, and then in 1978 we discover that we have not solved the problem concerning the noise, what are you going to say to the taxpayers then? Are you going to say the same thing we say now, that we have all this money invested, and we have to go forward with the program, and to those people who complain we say, "Just listen, and learn to live with the noise"?

Will not the argument in 1978 be the same argument, that we have got to go ahead, because we have already put in so much money and we cannot turn back?

Mr. CONTE. I am merely trying to give you both the pros and the cons of the SST.

This is a very tough problem. How to vote is going to be a tough decision for everyone here today.

Mr. YATES. Not for me.

Mr. CONTE. The Concorde is going to fly, and it is going to fly into the United States whether or not we have an SST.

So let me ask the gentleman from Illinois this question: Some of us who live either in the Maryland or Virginia area are very upset over the noise from jets flying into National Airport, also the heavy congestion. Either the CAB or the FAA has recommended that no jets from over 400 miles distant should fly into National Airport. They would land at Dulles. You know who has been fighting that? Your delegation, because that would affect the planes flying from Chicago. How does the gentleman stand on that?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Do we not have jet airplanes landing at National that fly there from New York, and does that make more or less noise than an airplane flying in there from Chicago? The noise level is the same, and the argument as to the 400-mile distance is totally a indefensible argument.

Mr. CONTE. Of course not. They have a traffic problem down there.

Mr. PUCINSKI. But not the noise.

Mr. CONTE. I do not yield further to the gentleman at this point.

There is a traffic problem, and a very serious one, at National. We do not have a traffic problem at Dulles, and you could divert all that Chicago traffic. If we diverted those planes to Dulles, it would decrease the noise factor because there would be fewer jets.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I fly into Dulles, if the gentleman wants to know. I fly into Dulles. You are arguing with the wrong guy.

Mr. CONTE. I hope we can get your support and get the support of the Chicago delegation.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield, why do you not fly your commercial planes from Boston and New York into Dulles? Especially those New York commuter planes.

Mr. CONTE. They do have some.

Mr. GROSS. If you want to come into National, then let us come into National.

Mr. CONTE. My home is about 150 miles from Boston.

We only have small planes going out of Pittsfield, Mass., which is my hometown.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. We know for a fact that in 1980 we are going to have more than 78 percent of the American population that is going to be centered in the 12 major urban areas of this country. The gentleman's constituency is one and mine is another.

We have had testimony here now from the sponsors of this bill that there will be a very serious noise problem for the first 6½ miles. They say after 6½ the rate of climb is so fast that the noise will be reduced.

I want the gentleman to tell this House what are you going to do? I am telling you when you have 79 percent of the American population living in these urban areas by 1980, what are you going to do with this noise problem?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) to answer that question.

Mr. BOLAND. All of the problems that are being raised here today, and properly so, with respect to noise and pollution, have been raised many times before.

This Congress has considered these matters before.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts has said, this is a more difficult year because ecology and environment have become of age.

We are now getting to the point in this particular program where we are developing prototypes to prove what most scientists and physicists both in the program and out of the program believe to be true.

All of the objections that have been raised by some of the experts and scientists who are not in the program have been raised before.

The Office of the Secretary of Transportation now has the direct responsibility for monitoring the prototype development of the SST. This part of the program commits the Government to the production of two prototypes and 100 hours of test flying. All of those in the program believe that we can solve the noise problem.

So you have to decide whom to believe.

I choose to believe those who over the years have been close to and part of this program.

I also happen to believe that this is a program that is essential to the economic health of the United States.

Despite what some may say on this floor, the fact of the matter is we are going to control the noise on the ground. We will be developing airports that will be able to control the sideline noises.

When the plane is 3.5 miles beyond the airport and is rising, the noise from the SST is less than the noise from the 707. This is absolutely correct. The noise on the ground may be greater from the SST than it is from the present generation aircraft. But I would like to say that

my judgment has been the conclusion reached by the committee that has reviewed this program.

We are concerned about the economic health of the Nation itself. The commercial airlines industry in the United States produces 80 percent of all the commercial aircraft in the world. No matter where you go, to any airport in this world, you will find American-built jets landing, taking off, or resting there.

The supersonic age is upon us. We have three countries that have flown planes supersonically; that is, England, France, and the Soviet Union. I don't care what anyone else says, American carriers are going to buy the Concorde when it is completed. They have already taken a number of positions, and when the Concorde is produced, American airlines will buy them. And they will be produced and available in a couple of years.

So it will be flying supersonically, and the American carriers will purchase it. The question is whether or not we are going to lose the great lead we have had in the production and sale of commercial aircraft around the world. I think this is a very important matter for members of this Committee of the Whole to consider. If we lose this lead, then the balance of payments, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has indicated, is going to suffer appreciably. I do not think anybody can discount this fact.

We are on our way to solving the problems that are connected with the SST with respect to noise, with respect to polluting the atmosphere, and no one—no one that I know of—has come up with any sound conclusion that the SST actually pollutes the stratosphere or builds up, as they say, great reservoirs of water.

There have been some indications that this might be so, but it is merely one of those "if" propositions. That is exactly what it is. Every single argument that has been raised about the SST in relation to polluting the atmosphere and also with respect to the noise problem, has been answered by distinguished scientists, physicists, mathematicians, and by those associated with the program. The hearings bear this out completely.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts has indicated, the Members will have to make up their own minds on this question. I happen to believe it is feasible, it can meet the problems of ecology and noise, and we ought to go ahead with the program.

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

Mr. CONTE. I will yield briefly to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I do not want to intrude too much on the gentleman's time. I appreciate his generosity in again yielding.

I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) a question. I notice the gentleman has remarked again that the SST will not be noisier than the 707 in the air. But that is small consolation, since the 707 is now the noisiest plane in the air. Would it not be wiser to try to curb some of the noise already in the air before we add more planes whose contribution to the general din will not be greater, we are assured, than that made by the noisiest planes now flying? I am not reopening now the question of noise produced by the SST on the ground, which I have discussed before.

Mr. BOLAND. Let me respond to the gentleman. The noise of the 707 may be unbearable to you, but the 707's are flying into the major airports of the United States now and, as I indicated, the community noise is the noise of 707's flying around those airports. There is more noise from those planes than there will be from the SST.

Since that is so, I think perhaps the noise of the SST would be bearable. Would the gentleman suggest that we stop all flights of 707's into all major airports of the United States?

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. If the gentleman will yield further, I am suggesting that the FAA set standards for noise levels around airports and require the airlines to meet these levels as required by law. It is now almost 2 years since the law was adopted, and the FAA has not even held hearings. Yet FAA spokesmen acknowledged to a group of us from both parties who met with them this winter that the prospect is for increased noise at most major metropolitan airports for the next few years at least. Millions of people who live around airports are being driven to distraction and apparently nobody is willing to do anything about it. Instead we are told it is in the public interest to ignore the sufferings of whole communities in favor of a theoretical saving of time for a small number of intercontinental travelers—from whom, incidentally, there has been no audible clamor for this peculiar favoritism. If the presnot act, should we not demand their reent members of the FAA cannot or will moval, or remove the functions they refuse or are unable to perform to some other agency? Why cannot some of this energy and money be invested in an effort to protect the health and peace of mind of people who live around airports?

Mr. BOLAND. I think we are moving in that direction. The FAA and the Office of the Secretary of Transportation, insofar as the SST is concerned, have indicated that the plane will not fly supersonically over populated areas. As the gentleman knows, they are now in the process of developing a rule which would forbid a plane from flying supersonically over populated areas. There are also some standards that are being established by the FAA and the Office of the Secretary with respect to noise around airports.

The Department of Transportation hopes to meet the problem of noise around the airports by reconfiguring or making better use of the airport property itself.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. One last brief point: If I understand the gentleman's point, it is that we should proceed to subsidize the building of new planes even though they cannot now meet acceptable standards so far as noise is concerned, and even though the FAA has not even held hearings to discover what acceptable standards would be.

I think it would be much better to go about it the other way: First, to adopt standards and then to let aircraft become operational that can meet these standards. We are inviting disaster by continuing to develop and use aircraft that do not meet reasonable noise standards. In fact, the FAA is now exempting both the 707's and more than 90 percent of the 747's in production from a standard that is already much too lax.

Furthermore, Pan Am for one is boasting that it will spend $300,000 per 707 to redesign and rebuild their wings to keep them in service another 15 or 20 years. But it is impossible to find $500,000 to reduce the noise level of these same planes by half. That tells a great deal about what the airlines regard as important.

If the FAA will not impose curbs on noise—as the statute expected and mandated it to do—be assured that noise will not be curbed. Noise is not self-receding, as it is not self-created. How can anyone justify spending millions, really hundreds of millions, of dollars to subsidize further inroads on the lives of millions of people while we do nothing to require the corporations we subsidize to respect the rights of these people, rights spelled out by common law and by commonsense and now made specific by statute? Is that not subsidizing corporate arrogance? Does it not contribute to the breakdown of respect for law and order when we give money to those who act as if they are, in fact, above the law? Even if we are to spend the public's money to ease the plight of air travelers, does anyone think this is the best place to begin? Anyone who thinks that has not tried to fly very much lately.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal about this noise problem and the change in airport locations, but paramount in my concern about the continuing spending on the SST is the fact that America today is facing a crisis in confidence in our Government, and whether we like it or not, it is there. To put a nearly $300 million boondoggle on top of all the other problems facing the average American is poor judgment at any time, but totally unacceptable today. It could well be the straw that broke the proverbial camel's back in public trust and confidence.

Like my colleagues, particularly I am sure on this side of the aisle, I have been lobbied vigorously by the administration to provide the $290 million requested for the SST program in fiscal 1971. I have great respect for the President and confidence in his judgment, but nobody is right all the time, and this time he is wrong.

I do not know how you can sustain a veto in educational funds for economy's sake and then turn around and fund the $300 million cut from education in a boondoggle for the international jet set.

This is an excellent time to consider what the taxpayers have gotten for the $708 million our Government has already invested in the project. From 1962 to

1966, we saw studies made on the various research and design aspects of a supersonic aircraft and we saw the selection of Boeing Co.'s swing-wing concept. Between 1967 and the present, we have seen the swing-wing design abandoned as impractical. Between February 28 and March 31 of this year, we saw a cost overrun of $76 million develop, $57 million of which must be assumed by the taxpayers.

In short, the SST has taken on many of the characteristics of a first-class boondoggle, and it is not even off the drawing boards, yet. The problem of the ear-splitting sonic boom has not been resolved, it would generate unprecedented noise at takeoff and serious drawbacks with regard to air pollution and ground contamination have been predicted. It has been determined that the SST would deposit large amounts of water vapor in the stratosphere which could actually induce significant changes in the world climate.

Considered on its own merits, or lack of them, the SST does not appear to be a reasonable investment of tax dollars. We must, however, consider this appropriation measure in relation to all of the other, far more crucial demands on the Federal Treasury.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I am keenly aware of the importance of prudence as we struggle to return some semblance of sanity to the fiscal affairs of our Government. Our committee has been agonizingly cautious in approving what must be regarded as minuscule increases for such priority programs as education, conservation, and management of our natural resources. Until the urgent requirements in these and other domestic crisis areas are met, I submit America's world travelers can forgo the convenience of saving a few hours on a trip to Paris or Rio.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair might say all Members have been given permission to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter with their remarks in the debate on this bill today.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

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

Mr. Chairman, as Members of the House know, I have been opposed to this program for a number of years. Today my opposition will be centered on three points.

First, I will make a point of order against the appropriation on the grounds that it is unauthorized; second, in the event that point of order is overruled, I will offer an amendment to strike the funds for the SST, as I did in the Appropriations Committee; and third, in the event that the motion to recommit does not contain an instruction to strike the funds for the SST, I would hope to get a rollcall vote on the question of the previous question in order that we may be able to amend the motion to recommit.

I do this, Mr. Chairman, because I believe the SST is a colossal waste of the taxpayers' money. Even if the plane flies successfully—and there is a very serious question as to whether it will—it is doubtful that it will be able to fly into any airport in the United States or to fly out of such airports because of the infernal racket that is created by the noise on takeoff. It will have the most powerful engines of any plane that has ever been created, and when we have power, we have noise, incredible, unacceptable noise, a terrible din.

It has so much power that it has this incredible amount of noise that accompanies it, and for a time before it attains a certain altitude the noise will be unbearable. That is why the Department of Transportation is talking about new airports in remote areas for the SST airplanes, so they will have airports that are away from the populated areas.

Apart from the question of having to appropriate the millions of dollars that will be necessary to provide the runways for the SST's, I do not know how the proponents answer the question about the time that is going to be lost on the ground as a result of the airports being built in remote areas. Does this not offset any gain that may come in the speed of the plane aloft?

Mr. Chairman, I am impressed by the uselessness of the SST program. In a day when enormous problems weigh in upon us from all sides, when deficits in the Federal budget are overwhelming again, as the President himself pointed out earlier this week, when the President is asking for, I think it is, an $18 billion increase in the debt ceiling, what possible use has the appropriation for the SST for the people of this country?

It is said that the Russians will be flying their Tupolev, and it is said that the British and the French will be flying their Concorde, but if they are as noisy as they are at the present time, they will not be flying them in this country, and they will not be flying them over land across the United States.

The answer to the threat of the Concorde and the Tupolev is: So what? Who benefits by it? The people? Certainly not. This kind of program gives them no benefit or advantage. This program is for a select few.

I asked that question of Secor Browne, the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, when he appeared before our subcommittee. I asked, "Mr. Browne, why should we have this appropriation?" He said that the plane will make money. I asked, "Why will it make money?" He said, "It will have 'snob appeal.'" This plane will have "snob appeal."

I ask, Mr. Chairman, whether or not this House should authorize the appropriation of $290 million this year, $225 million more next year, and hundreds of millions of dollars to complete the program in the years following in order to perfect a plane that has snob appeal? Is this what the taxpayers of this country want?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding, and I compliment the gentleman on the excellent research job he has done.

I believe we should bring out here today the fact that not only are there hundreds of millions of dollars in this research program, but also a question of additional expenditures for airports. Has the gentleman come to any figure as to how many billions of dollars it would cost for airport relocation, for lengthening runways, for moving airports out of town to accommodate this plaything?

Mr. YATES. There has been no estimate of that. I believe it depends in a measure on whether the program is authorized. If it is authorized and the plane comes into being, that will be a factor.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Even if the plane finally did fly and was acceptable, we would have to spend billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to move the airports, to relocate them, to accommodate the plane.

Mr. YATES. That is right, but that expenditure of billions of dollars would follow the possible expenditure of additional billions of dollars on this program.

Let me point out what I mean by that. Presumably at the end of phase 3 the Government will have spent $1.3 or $1.4 billion to develop the prototype plane.

The contract itself, in contrast to what the gentleman from Massachusetts said, looks to the development of the commercial plane, and is not intended to stop at the end of phase 3. In order to get the financing for phases 4 and 5, which are the phases that will remain after the development of the prototype, the FAA has been looking into private financing.

I asked the question of the witnesses before our committee as to what would happen if they could not get private financing and they said they would have to come back to the Government for that financing.

What does that mean? That means there would be an expenditure of an additional $3 billion to $4 billion on this program for the development of this plane.

Is that what the taxpayers of this country want? How do the Members think President John F. Kennedy would have resolved this problem if he had known that this program were going to cost five times more than he said would be the maximum amount that the program would cost the taxpayers? In 1962 he established a maximum limit on expenditures for the taxpayers on this program of $750 million. That sum has already climbed to $1.4 billion, and if the Government has to proceed with phases 3 and 4 it will cost the taxpayers $4 billion to $5 billion.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I commend and support the gentleman in opposing development of the SST. The gentleman has said he doubts very much if the American airlines will purchase the Concorde and attempt to fly it over the land area of this country. I agree with him.

Does the gentleman happen to know

how much the Air Force has expended in the settlement of damage claims as the result of sonic booms generated by the limited operation of supersonic military aircraft in this country?

Mr. YATES. I do not know the answer to that. I am trying to get that information now.

I believe the damage claims are still pending for that test period the Air Force had.

Of course, the administration says that they will not fly the supersonic planes across the land. I am glad the gentleman raised that point. Let me suggest what was said by General Jewell E. Maxwell, who used to be the head of the SST program. When the question of the sonic boom was raised he said:

> We believe the people in time will come to accept the sonic boom as they have the rather unpleasant side effects which have accomplished other advances in transportation.

That is why I believe if and when the SST comes into being it will be accompanied by the biggest kind of propaganda campaign to woo the American people into accepting the "wonderful world of the SST" or a slogan like "the sonic boom is the sound of progress."

That is what many Members who support this program say, "We are for progress." Is the SST's airport wise progress? Is the sonic boom progress?

But what happens to Earth Day when the people all over this country protested the defilement of this atmosphere, the fouling of the atmosphere, the fouling of our lakes and streams, and the incessant clamor and noise in our ears? Will the American people accept an SST that has excessive noise characteristics and accept a sonic boom? There can be no profit to a supersonic flight if it must fly subsonically overland.

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

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman will agree that the supersonic testing by the Air Force and the creating of sonic booms over cities has been a part of a plan to condition the American people to these sonic booms. I can find no other justification for sonic booms being created over large urban areas.

More importantly, a statement was made here that there would be no SST flights over large populated areas. The gentleman has done a great job of research on this subject. Can he conceive of any corridors across the United States from coast to coast that would not at some point cover an urban area or large populated area?

Mr. YATES. There is none, and I will say to the gentleman that witnesses before our committee testified that if there were no supersonic booms permitted over the United States, they would probably find a narrow strip of land like Mexico or the Panama Canal area over which the planes will fly. But I agree with the gentleman that there is no place in this country where the planes can fly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Illinois 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I want to congratulate the gentleman on an excellent research job that he has done in connection with the SST. I am concerned about sonic booms and other things but not so much as I am concerned about the economic sonic boom that has hit this country. I have heard and read that the administration is asking for an increase in the national public debt ceiling of $18 billion. Look at the ticker outside in connection with the stockmarket and see what the economic conditions in this country are today. I read yesterday where many of the operating airlines are now canceling out their orders or thinking of canceling their orders for the jumbo jet for many reasons. First of all, because of economic conditions and, secondly, because of a lack of business.

Will the gentleman from Illinois tell us what the difference is or would be between the 747, I believe it is, the jumbo jet, and the SST from the standpoint of their cost?

Mr. YATES. The 747, as I remember the figures placed before our committee, will cost about $20 million. The cost of the SST, when it is ready for the market—and that is predicted to be about 1982—will be in the neighborhood of $60 million. How many planes can the aircraft industry buy with that kind of pricing?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. If they are thinking of canceling out orders for the jumbo jets at a cost of $20 million, then how on earth could they buy many SST's for $60 million?

How many present airfields, I will ask the gentleman, if he will yield further, in the United States today could accommodate an SST?

Mr. YATES. You mean as far as the length of the runway is concerned?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. That is right.

Mr. YATES. I am not sure. I do not believe so because the SST may need a runway over 12,000 feet. I think the testimony before our committee was that the Concorde would be permitted to land only on one runway in Los Angeles.

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

Mr. YATES. I will yield to the gentleman in 1 minute if I am wrong. I am telling him that before our committee Mr. Beggs, the Under Secretary of Transportation, pointed out that there was one airport in Los Angeles that he thought would be willing to accept the Concorde on a remote runway.

I do not know about any other airport in the country that has said it would permit the Concorde to fly in. Does the gentleman know of any?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, as one who has supported this program up until this year, I am going to vote for the gentleman's amendment. I am worried about the economic conditions of this country.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman very much and I am very glad to have his support.

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

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding and compliment the gentleman upon his very knowledgeable presentation and rise in support of his amendment.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the gentleman in the well and wish to thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not we have reached a period that we ought to to try to subside the noise on this planet on which we live—the American Continent—by taking about $1.4 billion and putting it into the housing category and thereby keep people in safe, decent, and sanitary homes? I think this is important. Yet, we cannot get money for housing but we can get it for the SST—spend $1.4 billion on it.

I am certainly glad to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman and I shall vote for the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman and I agree with what he has said completely. I wish Boeing would find some way of converting its operations into housing or antipollution work. I do not think we would have any objection to that subsidy that the SST gives to Boeing.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, has there been anyone in the committee during the hearings who has suggested that we go over to France or to England and negotiate with them to fly one of their planes over here and see what the sound effect and the destruction it has on America? I think this would be a means of adopting a rather sagacious position and in addition saving a lot of money for housing about which we are constantly clamoring.

Mr. YATES. In Business Week of February 21—and as the gentleman knows, Business Week is no leftwing publication—this is what it says:

> Last spring above the din of the Concorde's engines at the Paris air show a New York airport official could be heard shouting that the plane would never be allowed near New York unless the production model was substantially quieter.

I will tell the gentleman that it cannot be substantially quieter because the production model is heavier than the prototype. A heavier airplane creates more noise. So we know what the situation is going to be.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

All this talk of sonic boom not being permitted in urban areas leaves those of us in rural areas concerned because it is just as important to those who live in rural areas even if there are only two people per square mile if an airplane creates this type of sonic boom and noise. We do not want that boom out on the prairie any more than you want it in Chicago or New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman. I want to tell the gentleman that the rural areas are going to get the airports because they will build them away from the populated centers.

I remember that I was asking about a third airport for Chicago of a witness who appeared before our committee and he told me and talked about a location that was 60 miles from the city itself.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I appreciate the gentleman's generosity in offering it to the rural areas, but this we will have to turn back.

Mr. YATES. That is what they are thinking about at the present time—remote areas in the less populated regions, so that the people who live in the cities will not be discomforted by the noise.

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

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

Mr. JACOBS. Is it possible this committee might develop a new concept of "more boom for the buck" in this project?

Mr. YATES. It is a question of boom or bust.

My friend from Washington talks about the Concorde flight and the Tupolev flight. I saw the Concorde too and I walked through its fuselage. Najeeb Halaby, president of Pan American World Airways called it a return to the tube. That is what it is. There is still a doubt as to whether or not they can get 100 passengers into the Concorde and if they cannot, they are never going to have an economic kind of flight.

When I asked about the differences between the Concorde and the Tupolev they said they were very similar. So I suspect the Russians are having the same kind of difficulties that the French and the British are with the Concorde. So that until we see a production model of those planes we had better not say that the supersonic age is upon us.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS).

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time in general debate to discuss the SST because I think in view of a number of the remarks from those of us who support poverty programs and those of us who are concerned about the budget, and so on, and who have joined with the efforts to try to make our country a better place, environmentalwise, and so on, that we should indicate why it is we support this program.

If we do not support our industries that hire people, that produce jobs, that pay taxes and do the day-by-day things in America, we are not going to have any industrial and tax base to do a number of other things that we want to do.

I want to describe the present situation of the aerospace industry. Several remarks were made about having the aerospace industries convert to do other things. Many of us have urged the industry to convert to other things and they have tried, but even worse they are losing the customers they have. Two years ago it was the largest industry in the non-agricultural area in the country. It employed over 1.3 million as compared with 880,000 in the automobile industry, and 523,000 in the steel industry. This dropped to 850,000 in 1968, and dropped to 768,000 in 1969. The SST will not stop the drop but only slow it.

I have supported programs which have tried to convert our industry from war to peace, and remember this is a peace-oriented airplane program. I have supported the mass transportation industry, with a number of the rest of the Members. I have supported the program with 100 cosponsors to try to build high-speed trains, and maintain a railroad program. I sit on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I believe in a balanced transportation system. But what is happening in this country is that we no longer have any airplane development moving forward as we used to have in the military area. There is no airplane that can be converted as the 707 was, to bring in a commercial model that would compete with foreign jets.

Many people may have forgotten that the British produced the Comet, and the British had the jet field to themselves, and the only thing that helped the United States was that we happened to have a flyaway prototype 707 that eventually developed into the 727, the 737 and the 747, and then Douglas built the DC-8 and the DC-9, and so on.

I want to tell you that I have seen the British-French Concorde and discussed the Russian plane with those who have seen it and I can guarantee that they will fly. You can say in the cities with the problem of noise you are going to have to build airports out of the cities, whether the United States builds an SST or not, and you are going to have to connect these airports with the cities through the mass transportation facilities, such as rapid rail lines that can move people in and out to them. There is no other way you are going to be able to make the airplane and in fact the whole transportation system of America work.

And you talk about the jet set. Who rides the jet airplanes today? It is not a bunch of party boys. If you were to get on those airplanes as often as I do, and as most of the other Members of this House do, you would find that those flying on our present jets are the men of this country who are busy, men who are trying to build our Nation—its schools, its business, its professions and they have to be able to get back and forth quickly, these men are probably using their lives faster than they should by working hard and flying all the time but they make our Nation grow and prosper.

And when you talk to the people from the cities that say that we will never let one fly in here you will find a competition developing between Boston, for example, and New York City, and between Philadelphia and Washington, as to who will have the overseas transportation business. The British-French Concorde will fly in here, and the Russians will want to fly in the Tupolev-144. These are flyaway airplanes. They are very good airplanes. And when you talk about when they start flying them over the cities they are going to say all right, who is going to be able to put up with them and I say our Nation will go ahead. We are talking about a program that is a program to produce jobs, and one way of producing jobs is by trying to keep the aerospace industry alive. I do not know what will happen to this industry, but I am very worried about it. I am concerned from a very personal point of view over what has happened in my district in recent months. The gentleman from Alabama mentioned the fact that the 747's were not being picked up. The reason they are not being picked up is because right now we are in a very tight money situation, and the airlines cannot afford to buy anything. They want them, and they would like to have them, but they are being squeezed at this time, but the moment that stops we are going to have people wanting the airplanes.

But what has happened in terms of the aerospace industry because of the cutbacks in defense and because of the cutbacks in space? I can tell you what has happened in the Seattle-Renton area in Washington. In December 1967 there were 101,000 people working in aerospace. On December 30, 1968, there were 95,000 people. On December 30, 1969, there were 80,000. And since the first of this year it has dropped over 20,000 people, and we now have only 60,700 employed.

Now there are 20,000 people who are not working and who are not paying taxes and are not able to support themselves.

Somehow the community has to do something about that. I believe in programs to help the communities. I believe in the housing program. I believe in the poverty program. I have supported liberal programs in the House and I know that many others have too. I support business programs also that make these things possible and keep people working so they do not need unemployment compensation or need welfare. I hope the other Members will support this program.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to eliminate the funds in this bill for development of the SST. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. Chairman, it would be easy to resort to ridicule of the SST—to note, for example, that as an unprecedented government venture in civil aviation it could become known as history's first supersonic trial balloon.

Unfortunately, the SST's threat to good judgment is too big to belittle. That threat is neatly stated in these final sen-

tences from a Department of Transportation position paper dated May 21:

Transportation has progressed to the age of supersonic travel. To ask American industry to produce yesterday's products for today's markets would not be realistic.

The first assertion begs the question. It is not transportation which has arrived in the supersonic era. It is technology. This is a classic case of technology shopping for a customer—not at all the proper sequence of technology stepping in to satisfy a need. No need whatsoever has been established for the SST. For that matter, not all technological problems have been mastered.

The second sentence of the report is almost a joke. American industry is not being asked to produce an SST—it is being subsidized and all but commanded to do so. And there is no such thing as "today's markets" for the SST. There are mathematics of speed and passenger capacity that imply productivity, but mathematics are not markets.

Mr. Chairman, the DOT position paper speaks of the Soviet SST, the TU-144, with awe, as if it were the sputnik of world aviation. That may be good melodrama, but it is poor economics.

DOT alleges that the Federal Government would recover its high-risk investment in the SST with "royalties from the sale from the first 300 planes." Even if recoverability of investment was the most important question, who will buy these aircraft? The Chase Manhattan Bank forecast predicted last fall that between then and 1980, U.S. airlines will spend $53 billion for new flight equipment. Does recoverability depend on the airlines getting that kind of money?

Most serious, from my own point of view is the fact that the SST is environmental nonsense as well. Its "sideline noise" will be four or five times louder than the 747—a fury of sound—far exceeding FAA noise standards.

On E-Day, many Members of this House gave speeches declaring that individuals must begin to make conscious personal decisions to protect our environment from further pollution degradation. How credible will this body be if we ignore our own advice and allow compulsive consumption to blind us to the environmental degradation now designed into the SST.

Gentlemen, there is a crisis of confidence in this country. It is related not just to the war or to the state of the economy. It is broader than that. It is rooted in the public's reluctance to believe in the ability of their leaders to make the right choices, to support the right set of values. We will not contribute to their confidence in our leadership ability by plowing an additional $290 million into SST development.

At a time when we have proven domestic markets for clean air and water, for more health facilities, and better schools, we will not be applauded for astute judgment if we take a flier on the SST.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. The gentleman referred to the fact that there was no market for the SST. Does the gentleman know that there are 122 reservations for the American-built SST plane right now?

Mr. OBEY. I think reservations are a good deal different from finally placing the orders for those same planes especially in light of the fact that we are seeing an inability right now of some of the airlines even to purchase the 747.

Mr. PELLY. Does the gentleman know the American airlines put in their own money on these reservations and they are prepared to buy them?

I have in my hand a little item which the gentleman may have seen, in the Washington Post of this morning, which says:

SOVIET SST

Moscow.—The Soviet Union's entry in the supersonic transport race, the TU-144, hit 1,336.5 miles an hour, or about twice the speed of sound, in a test flight Monday.

That was on Monday. I have in my hand an advertisement of the plane which Concorde built. As the gentleman knows, the plane is built by the France and British Aircraft Corporation, and they are advertising it right now. They say it is "better than predicted." So the gentleman had better look this over in the interest of the economy of this country and the American workman, and let them build the supersonic plane, rather than relegating it to foreign nations.

We have had 80 percent of all the overseas business for our civilian air transport planes. That is the one item on which we have not priced ourselves out of the world market. If you really want to wreck this economy, vote against this research work to build a prototype so we can retain our supremacy.

Mr. OBEY. It would seem to me that if the airlines were interested in actually purchasing this plane, they would be willing to provide some money to develop the prototype in the first place.

Second, I think there is a larger question involved than merely the economic question. I think there is the basic question whether or not we are going to take into consideration, in accepting new advances in technology, the effect of that technology on the erosion of our environment. I hope we begin to do that, and I hope we start with this program.

Mr. PELLY. The gentleman from Washington is on the Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology of the Science and Astronautics Committee. We have had plenty of testimony indicating that our research is paying off. We have quieter engines, we have smokeless engines, and if you give this one item a chance, we will produce a superior civilian air transport plane that will not be offensive to the environment, because we have the technology to do it.

Mr. OBEY. I hope you are right, but in the absence of proof that that is indeed forthcoming, I would prefer to rely on the advice of the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, Mr. Train.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us once again illustrates the House's unwillingness firmly to commit itself to a balanced transportation policy.

The Senate has passed a bill providing for 5-year contractual authority mass transit. If enacted, according to the committee report, the Urban Mass Transportation Administration would propose to obligate $850 million for fiscal year 1971. The committee opposes this and has written a limitation in the bill prohibiting administrative expenses for mass transportation grants exceeding $214 million in fiscal year 1971. The reason for the limitation—the committee feels it must consider the priority of urban mass transit grants against other programs in the transportation budget.

I agree with the committee about the need to consider priorities. But I disagree strongly with the committee that the place to impost such a limitation is in the urban mass transportation program.

The committee has not seen fit to impost limitations upon the Federal-aid highway program. The committee recommends an appropriation of $4,350,000 for Federal aid to highways through the highway trust fund.

Here is where our priorities have gone awry.

This country is presently facing a serious transportation crisis. Today, it is virtually impossible to get from one area to another without experiencing delays resulting from either traffic jams or poor transportation systems.

The emphasis upon highways as an answer to national transportation problems has resulted, not in efficient rapid transportation, but in miles of roads which virtually form interstate parking lots. And it has contributed heavily to air pollution.

The best way to get motor vehicles off the road, permit those without automobiles to get around, and help clean the air is by providing mass transportation. Adequate transportation is important to every aspect of our life—economic, social, and recreational.

Because of our refusal to acknowledge the need for adequate mass transportation, existing transit lines have gradually and steadily deteriorated. In the past 20 years, the number of transit lines has decreased by 300, the number of transit vehicles has decreased by 27,000, the number of passengers has decreased by 7.2 billion, and revenues have gone from a profit of $66 million annually to a deficit of $160 million. Services have been cut back; rates have been increased.

One would think that the House would be struck by the need to save and rejuvenate the Nation. But this bill imposes a limitation on mass transit grants and continues support for the building of more highways. While the Federal Government has spent huge sums of money on the building of more highways, it has spent a mere pittance on mass transit.

The following table shows the obligation of funds for the urban mass transportation fund as compared with the highway trust fund:

Year	Highway trust fund	Urban mass transit fund
1967	$3,734,448,000	$156,925,000
1968	4,171,094,000	131,873,000
1969	4,599,283,000	134,871,000
1970 estimate	3,942,630,000	180,000,000
1971 estimate	4,810,420,000	214,000,000

In testimony before the House Banking and Currency Committee, I urged the provision of obligational authority of at least $10 billion over the next 5 years.

Many cities will need money within the next 10 years to modernize existing systems or finish work on already systems. These cities include: Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, New York, Philadelphia, and San Francisco.

Other cities will need funds to develop newly proposed transportation systems in such places as Atlanta, Baltimore, Los Angeles, Miami, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Pittsburgh, and Washington.

An example of the magnitude of the problem is in the State of New York. The New York State Metropolitan Transportation Authority has estimated that it will require $2.1 billion in the next 7 years. If the State receives the same part of mass transit appropriations as in the past, Federal assistance would be 20 to 25 percent of the cost, leaving a balance beyond the ability of local government to pay.

In order to solve this transportation crisis, we must not only provide Federal assistance for the acquisition of capital equipment, but also for subsidization of operating costs.

I have introduced legislation, since 1966, which would allow the Federal Government to underwrite a large part of the operating expenses of any transportation facility which provides commuter service to an area.

This bill, H.R. 47 in the 91st Congress, would amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, by providing grants on a two-thirds to one-third matching basis to local public transportation authorities having broad responsibilities for maintenance of commuter transportation.

We must acknowledge that the cost of transit systems is not limited only to construction and other capital improvements. Operating expenses play a very important role in the costs of a commuter system.

My legislation would make both of these costs eligible for Federal assistance, erasing the artificial line which has existed in the past.

Under the 1964 Mass Transit Act, no State can receive capital grants exceeding the 12½ percent of the funds authorized, except that under a 1966 amendment to the 1964 act, the Secretary has a discretionary fund of $12.5 million to use in States which have received grants in excess of two-thirds of the maximum grants under the 12½-percent ceiling.

I have continually opposed these arbitrary ceilings, and I have introduced H.R. 627 to repeal the limitation, which ignores the hard fact that certain States with high urban populations need transit funds a great deal more than States which are predominantly rural.

I have also continually pointed out the disparity between Federal funds for highways and mass transit. Money in the Federal highway trust fund should be available for other urban transportation. I have introduced legislation in the past three Congresses to accomplish this. My bill, H.R. 48, would permit a State to elect to use funds from the highway trust fund for urban mass transit purposes.

Under present law the Federal share of the net project cost is two-thirds. I feel this should be increased to 90 percent as under the Federal highway program. Local governments should not be tempted to select highways over mass transit because the Federal Government will finance highways to a greater extent.

If we do not commit ourselves to decent and adequate transportation for all Americans, the present transportation crisis will reach emergency proportions. It is so serious now that the discrepancy in the bill between aid for highways and for mass transit is totally unwarranted.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to strike the $290 million for the SST from the fiscal 1971 transportation appropriation bill. The value of the supersonic transport to our society has yet to be demonstrated, but numerous authorities have testified as to its tremendous potential for harm.

Meteorologists and other experts have warned that the large amount of air pollution to be caused by SST's will result in greater cloud cover, less heat from the sun, and an eventual reduction in the earth's temperature. No less of an authority than Russell Train, the chairman of the President's Council on Environmental Quality, recently stated:

> Clearly the effects of supersonics on the atmosphere are of importance to the whole world. Any attempt to predict those effects is necessarily highly speculative at this time. The effects should be thoroughly understood before any country proceeds with a massive introduction of supersonic transports.

Moreover, the SST promises to make a large contribution to the world's noise pollution level. Most critics, quite naturally, have singled out the sonic boom as particularly harmful, but engine noise may be even more destructive to a peaceful environment. The SST's engine will be three to four times as loud as the present legal limits for aircraft engine noise.

Economically the SST is very questionable. Overall its cost has been estimated at approximately $1.3 billion. But, in the nature of such estimates, the SST already has experienced a $76 million cost overrun even before the aircraft has entered the costly prototype phase.

Mr. Speaker, proponents of the SST often argue that they are for "progress," and that we who oppose the plane oppose "progress." If there is one lesson we should have learned by now from the environmental crisis, it is that "progress" must not be measured solely by technological advances. It must include a concern for the development of a cleaner, safer, and more pleasant environment for us and for our children. By this criteria the SST does not represent "progress." Rather, it represents an alarming potential for the accelerated destruction of our environment.

The amendment to eliminate SST funds offers this House an opportunity to begin to reorder our Nation's priorities away from costly and unnecessary spending and toward a commitment to deal with our Nation's pressing social needs. I urge approval of the amendment.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am in full agreement with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and hope that it has the support of the majority of this House.

Today we have the opportunity to take the initial steps to prevent a tragic mistake. Let's stop the SST. If we do not stop it then our action will become an irreversible commitment, necessitating a multibillion-dollar public subsidy of a project whose claimed advantages are mere illusions and whose actual advantages are trivial.

All along, the arguments for supersonic transports have been of the mystical kind—the urge to the ultimate, the irrepressible human desire for bigger and faster machines, the challenge of design.

What does it matter if this supersonic transport permits a passenger in having lunch or dinner in London or Paris instead of on a conventional superjet?

We are faced with a critical decision. With the design now complete we are asked to fund the SST through appropriations which would permit the building of a prototype of the highly questionable plane, which will serve the needs of a small minority of our people.

Before we fund any money for this untried experiment, we should reevaluate our national priorities and divert these funds to combat problems on our homefront. Many crucial programs urgently needing money have been cut back in the name of curbing inflation, while the unnecessary SST takes a $290 million bite out of the Federal budget. There has been cut $204 million from mass transportation funds, $106 million from air pollution control, $85 million from consumer protection projects. We can obtain greater value for our money if we spent the $290 million to clean pollution which we already have than to add to it through the construction of the SST.

We have been told that if the United States stays in the race to build and fly the supersonic transport, we will preserve a part of our world prestige. Mr. Chairman, our national prestige depends more on our ability to insure the well-being of all our citizens and to make the United States the first industrial Nation to come to terms with its environment—not on spending billions to build an unnecessary, unwanted airplane.

The SST has become a symbol of technology out of control, of priorities misplaced. For these reasons I support the pending amendment to delete funds for the SST.

While President Nixon recommends the go-ahead on the SST, his own advisors are at odds with him on this project.

Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, Director, White House Office on Science and Technology stated:

> On the whole I come out negative on the desirability for further government subsidy for the development of this plane. . . . The government should not be subsidizing a device which has neither commercial attractiveness nor public acceptance.

The Chairman of the Special Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee, Dr. Richard L. Garwin, said the following:

I recommend the immediate termination of the U.S. government's direct or indirect support of the SST program. When conditions are right for a commercial program which can be accommodated without severe environmental penalties, U.S. industry and finance will rise to the occasion.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to accept this amendment.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I am voting against this appropriations bill, which contains numerous very essential agencies and programs, as a protest against the manner in which it allocates funds. It reduces items which would serve the mass of our people and then uses tax funds of $290 million on a supersonic transport which will serve few to the discomfort of masses of people.

We need high speed ground transportation; there are threats of discontinuing our most essential passenger trains and leaving areas like my district in eastern Montana without adequate transportation service. So we have $900,000 for development of high speed ground transportation in this bill—less than one-third of 1 percent of the SST cost.

We need more timber to keep lumber and housing costs down. To get it, we need to develop forest roads into inaccessible commercial timber areas ready for harvest, but this bill has cut $5 million or 20 percent out of that fund.

The bill saves money on highway safety, on railroad research, on payments to air carriers serving smaller communities—on virtually every item that the mass of citizens really need, and then blows all of it, and more, on an experimental plane that will save an hour each for Paris travelers but will be paid for by all the rest of us.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I can understand the determined effort on the part of those whose districts will be adversely affected by the acceptance of this amendment but I am diametrically opposed to providing tax funds for this research project at this time because I believe it is not the kind of program that deserves priority over other necessities in these critical times.

It is my conviction that our most critical problem is that of inflation caused by spending beyond our income. I have consistently stated that we have a responsibility to our people not only to refuse to fund unnecessary programs but to refuse to fund good programs which can be delayed.

I am not opposed to the development of the SST. I do not buy the fears expressed by the gloom peddlers who concoct all manner of scare criticisms in order to defeat the development. Certainly the technological ability of this Nation is such that whatever bugs develop can be ironed out.

On the other hand this is one program that can be delayed without serious consequences.

I base my opposition to the funding of the SST on need to take bold, and imaginative steps to balance the budget. Very shortly this House will be asked to increase significantly the debt limitation. I will oppose this increase as I have opposed the requested increases in debt limitations—some nine or 10—since I have been a Member of this House because I believe that unless to put a halt to the amount of money the bureaucrats can borrow they will continue to spend over our income. The place to do the job is here. The time is now. If we do not cut items we can get along without where are we to cut?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, during the past years I have received many letters, wires and phone calls, concerning the SST. Because of this, I have had my staff make a complete study of the subject. After viewing the arguments pro and con, I am convinced that is in the best interest of the priorities that beset this Nation to vote to discontinue the SST. The reasons are many that made me determine my position. That study follows:

SST

DO WE NEED THE SST?

The proponents of the SST believe that the way to continue improvement in air travel, particularly international travel, is through increased productivity—that is getting the most work possible per unit plane. Productivity is defined as the number of passenger seats available multiplied by the speed in miles per hour.

We can increase productivity by increasing the size of an airplane or by increasing its speed or both size and speed. It is felt by the proponents of the SST that if we go much beyond the jumbo jet (747) in size, we must then consider larger airports, longer runways, and increased demands on the air traffic control systems. This reasoning is important to note: Because it is contradictory. Reasons below.

PROBLEMS

a. The SST, because of its very size, needs some 10,900 ft. (over two miles) to get off the ground. It must reach a speed of 227 mph (almost twice that of many existing planes) to get off the ground. *Therefore*, the SST demands larger airports, longer runways, and increases demands on the air traffic control systems.

b. Speed. Proponents of the SST feel that a 1,800 mph SST would reduce flight time across the North Atlantic from 5½ hours (by jumbo jet) to 2½ hours. But what really counts is door-to-door travel time. Traveling by SST instead of jumbo jet, a businessman going from a hotel in New York to a hotel in London would reduce his over-all travel time from 9 hours to 6 hours. (NOTE: the jumbo jet can make the trip non-stop, hence can fly a great-circle route. The SST must stop to refuel.) The saving in door-to-door travel time would be only about 30%. This saving would be made at the price of eliminating time for rest and sleep, and complication with the biological clock problem.

c. Comfort. The SST will have one aisle, general roominess will be inferior to that of jumbo jet. Seat belts will have to be fastened longer and probably throughout most of the flight. The SST will be so expensive that few standby planes will be available. If mechanical of electrical trouble develops (which is likely to occur because of the enormous number of highly complex instruments and controls) delays will be long because of the serious dangers that could result from malfunction of equipment.

The Department of Transportation feels that the SST program will provide the thrust needed to maintain our leadership in the commercial aviation field, particularly in the international market. The department feels that this Nation must either compete vigorously for this market or lose its historical preeminence. The logic which leads to this argument is spurious.

a. Our aviation industry is second to none. Our power does not depend upon the building of one questionable airplane.

b. There is little global prestige in performing a technical stunt simply because we have the knowhow. The French-British Concorde & Soviet TU-144 show no signs of dominating the aircraft market, as a matter of fact, the British are seriously considering dropping the Concorde because of the cost (in price inflation, cost over-runs.

c. The U.S. SST is being financed by public funds (90% Fed. and 10% industry) unlike the two other models.

d. If the British and the French wish to build an uneconomical plane, let them. Let them be the ones to find that SST's are expensive, dangerous, and unnecessary. Let them be the ones to reap the harvest of protests over take-off noise and sonic boom. We do not have to apologize for declining to pour billions of dollars into a very questionable project.

THE SST WILL PROVIDE JOBS

The SST will provide jobs, but what kind of jobs? Experts on the SST ad hoc Review Committee dispose of this claim. If Boeing SSTs are built, the fewer subsonic planes would be built; in creating jobs building SSTs, we would be destroying jobs building jumbo jets and air buses. Also, the jobs created would be "concentrated in professional, managerial, skilled, and semi-skilled occupations which in a period of full employment, when these skills are in short supply, may prove inflationary. Very few unskilled workers will be required.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

It is believed by the proponents of the SST that this plane will help solve our "balance of payment" problems. The report by the Panel on Balance of payments and International Relations noted that since the SST would increase tourist travel (mostly Americans go abroad), the positive effect on the balance of payments is questionable. The President's SST ad hoc Review Committee gave a resounding "NO" to this prospect. The large sum of money paid by those foreign airlines for the purchase of the Boeing SSTs would be more than offset by the ever larger sums paid to those airlines by U.S. tourists (for airplane tickets to Europe, say) and by the additional billions of dollars those tourists would spend abroad for hotel rooms, food, and luxury purchases. Even the advocates of SSTs agree that sales of Boeing SSTs would be disappointingly small unless the speed of the SST stimulates millions more people to travel. Who will these people be, that travel in extra-fare planes? U.S. citizens, mainly. Thus the more SSTs are sold to foreign airlines, the more our balance of payments will be hurt—by U.S. citizens' buying flight tickets from the foreign airlines and making purchases abroad.

SONIC BOOM

The sonic boom is a sudden pressure disturbance, or shockwave, in air. The sonic boom, like gravity, is a fact of nature. Aerodynamics experts who have spent years doing research on the sonic boom admit that there is simply no way to eliminate the boom.

a. The SST is to be the heaviest supersonic plane in existence and its boom is expected to be more intense that that from any other plane in existence flying at similar altitude and speed.

b. The typical overpressure to be produced at the ground by an SST flying overhead at cruising altitude (65,000 ft at 1,800 mph) is about 2.0 to 3.0 pounds per square foot (psf).

c. Each SST will produce a noise trail

(sonic boom) 50 miles wide throughout its trip.

d. Sonic boom damage: demonstrations and tests. In the last ten years much has been learned as to the damage sonic booms do to buildings. Accidental damages caused by military planes flying too low: Ottawa, Canada in 1959, $500,000 damage; Oklahoma City, mid 1950's $500,000 damage; etc. . . .

e. As soon as it was realized that extra-severe sonic booms could do serious damage to buildings, the U.S. Government, hoping to go forward with its SST program, planned several series of sonic boom tests over cities. No SST existed, so smaller and lighter military planes were used at lower altitudes. The result—In the long and elaborate sonic boom tests conducted by the FAA over Oklahoma City in 1964, the average boom overpressure (according to official Government report) was only 1.3 psf. Yet, more than 4,000 claims for damage to window glass, plaster, etc., were filed by Oklahoma residents. By mid-1969 the total damage awards to Oklahoma City homeowners amounted to over $123,000, and $128,000 in additional claims was still in litigation.

f. All available information indicates that the effects of sonic boom are such as to be considered intolerable by a very high percentage of the people affected. Supersonic flight over U.S. continental land areas is not contemplated at this time and that SST design and development is proceeding on this assumption. However there is concern about the economic pressures that will be exerted if it is subsequently found that the economic success of the aircraft depends on overland flights at supersonic speeds.

AIRPORT NOISE

The high temperature, high-velocity jets required for supersonic flight are noisier than subsonic fan engines. On landing and takeoff the SST is expected to produce noise levels exceeding 100 PNdB. The noise from 50 whisper jets taking off at the same time would be equivalent to one SST noise on take-off.

Prolonged exposure to intense noise will be intolerable to a very high percent of the exposed population, and may result in: Permanent hearing loss; cardiovascular, glandular, respiratory, and neurologic changes; possibly chronic physiologic disturbances.

HAZARDS TO PASSENGERS AND CREWS

The SST is not a military plane, it is being developed for commercial passenger use. 298 people will be at stake every time an SST goes up. There are a number of operational and environmental hazards that will be encountered while accelerating from zero to mach 3 and cruising at supersonic speeds in a hostile environment.

a. Rapid acceleration: man loses consciousness at an acceleration load of 5g. Turbulent flight may cause brief linear acceleration of 10 to 12g. The only advantage of the SST is speed all else has been sacrificed. For example, the maneuverability of the SST is poor. For the SST to make a sharp turn it would take 100 miles, loss of time, great loss of fuel. The SST will be traveling so fast, 1 mile in 2 seconds, that a pilot looking at a point 10 miles in front of him has 20 seconds to make a decision. Remembering it takes 100 miles to make a sharp turn.

b. Cabin temperature: crusing, the SST's exterior temperature will be 260° C.; therefore, unlike subsonic flights, the cabin must be refrigerated.

Toxic factor: at cruise altitudes for the SST, ozone is present in concentrations which would be highly toxic to passengers if allowed to enter the plane.

d. Cabin pressure: due to the great reduction in air pressure at the SST's 65,000 foot cruising altitude, should cabin pressure fail, all aboard would lose consciousness within 15 seconds.

e. Radiation hazard: SST crews may have to be placed in the category of radiation workers and kept under close surveillance since a flight crew exposed for 600 hours annually will accumulate 0.85 rem (roentgen-equivalent-man) and 0.5 rem is the maximum permissible dose for the general public. Pregnant women may not be allowed to fly in SST's.

ECONOMICS

A. Demand for SST. Uncertainties cloud future demand for the SST, causing plane sales forecasts to vary from 500 to 250. All of the statements made above come into play here. Each plane, by the time they are ready to be mass produced, will cost in the area of 50 to 60 million dollars each. The airline industry just cannot afford this without substantial subsidies from the government. Tax payers will have to support this dream and never be able to fly in it because the fares will be so high.

B. Financing. At present, the government is paying 90% of the cost for production of the SST. Private industry is supposed to pay 10% of the cost. Any decision on the SST program must consider that the government may be required to act as guarantor of funds needed by Boeing. By 1975 a cumulative financing of $1,064 million will exist—well in excess of twice Boeing's net worth as of Dec. 31, 1965. The U.S. airlines industry—supposed to provide 80% of total cash requirements for heavy SST start-up costs during 1975–77—is already overcapitalized. It just doesn't make any sense.

CONCLUSION

1. *A reordering of National Priorities.*—You have opposed the war in Viet Nam and done all you could to cut funds from the appropriations budget. Until we stop wasting money we will never be able to handle our domestic problems. The SST is bad economic fenture, we do not need it for our national prestige. The prestige of this country has suffered much because of internal strife. Our nation doesn't need an SST, but it does need more money for health, education, and welfare (vetoed by the President). At this time it would be in line with a reordering of national priorities to drop the SST, maybe to pick it up at a later date when we have more scientific studies and more money.

2. *Ecology.*—You have taken a very definite stand on the quality of our environment. You called for a moratorium on road construction and airport construction in and around Boston. The primary reason for this moratorium is to protect PEOPLE, against noise, air pollution, congestion. The time has come when we must stop and consider the effects, both short and long range, of our construction decisions. The SST will only add to these problems. If the SST is passed what are some of the effects on Logan.

a. The SST will require longer runways. Thus Logan will have to construct runways of at least 10,900 feet (over two miles). At present I believe the runways at Logan are between 8 and 9000 feet. To vote for the SST means that the runways at Logan will have to be extended. Three weeks ago we sent a letter to Secretary Volpe asking for a stop to all construction at Logan. This would be inconsistent.

b. The SST will further complicate air traffic control. Since the SST consumes fuel at the enormous rate of ½ ton/minute, it cannot remain in a holding pattern like other jets. It must be given special treatment.

c. The study of Bolt, Beranek and Newman, Inc. done for the Department of Transportation and the Housing and Urban Development showed that jet noise at Logan is already unbearable. Hence, it recommended that four-engine jets be banned from Logan. The SST is considerably noisier than the four-engine 707. Hence, the SST at Logan, producing 125 decibels (50 jets taking off at once), would make a bad problem unbearable.

d. The air pollution during take-offs will be gigantic since during take-offs the SST will burn 1 ton of fuel/minute. This, too, is a step in the wrong direction toward abating air pollution at jet ports.

e. Jet ports are being opposed all over the country because of their excessive noise and pollution. The SST will make second airports even more difficult to build.

f. Studies at Logan have shown that current jets startle children, annoy residents . . . the SST is a step backwards.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 17755 and especially the SST program. The bill under consideration provides over $2 billion of which approximately $290 million is for the furtherance of the SST program.

The prospects of supersonic transport in commercial operation are both exciting and unique. Without the SST program the United States would lose its position of leadership in the field of aviation as an aircraft supplier. As air transportation moves into the supersonic age, our aircraft industry would be subject to disintegration. U.S. industry presently supplies 80 percent of all commercial planes and parts used throughout the world. It is estimated that due to the loss of sales of U.S. supersonics combined with the purchase of foreign-built SST's by U.S. airlines, the result would be an unfavorable swing of billions of dollars in the balance of payments over the period of the SST program.

It is very important to note that under this program the Government will recover its full investment plus a royalty from the sale of the first 300 planes. Sales above this number will provide additional profits to the Federal Government.

Although there is very little substance to the critics' claims that substantial harm will naturally result from the development of the SST, there are very real threats to the national interest if the plane is not put into production as scheduled.

The SST is a product of the progress of mankind. We advocate the supersonic transport not merely for reasons of prestige, but for the economic benefits its sale and use will bring to the United States. America's aviation leadership is the prime issue here.

Our domestic economy will be greatly benefited by the SST program. Although benefits will be spread throughout all 50 States, a very heavy impact will be placed upon Ohio, and especially upon the Cincinnati area. Thousands of jobs will be created by the adoption of this program and the effect of a halt or slowdown in the SST project would, therefore, be very serious.

The SST has been criticized for a variety of reasons: pollution, noise and sonic boom. Yet scientific evidence clearly indicates to the contrary. The SST program does, in fact, comply with the Environmental Quality Control Act. It is interesting to note that engines used in land transportation vehicles convert 30 to 50 percent of the fuel consumed into air pollutants where turbine engines convert less than 1 percent of the fuel into pollutants.

In an attempt to understand the impact of noise generation on airport environment and surrounding communities,

aggressive studies of engine influences, basic research, airplane operational procedures and scale model/full-scale testing are being made. Improved operational techniques and additional suppression devices are a solution to this challenge. With regard to possible sonic booms, flights at boom-producing speeds will not be permitted over populated areas. I firmly believe that the doubts raised by opponents of the SST program have been satisfactorily resolved and can safely be dispelled.

I urge that the Members of the House support the decision of the President to enable the United States to maintain this leadership.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, this is no time to appropriate funds for unneeded and unwanted items. Our economy is now feeling the adverse effects of frivolous spending in the past. We must now practice fiscal integrity and allocate funds only for those programs which improve the health, welfare and security of the American people.

The proposed SST investment of $290 million in Federal funds does nothing of the kind. Less than 3 percent of the American public could be expected to use this expensive "luxury" which would probably cause more problems than it would solve.

A host of expert panels have concluded that the SST is not a good investment at this time. Study after study has shown that there are too many problems with the SST to warrant spending tax dollars on it at this time.

For example, the experts from the University of California who cheered the study of the SST during President Johnson's administration subsequently published an article in a professional journal saying why the SST should not be built now. Former FAA Administrator Quesada has also strongly opposed going forward with production of this aircraft now.

He has recently been joined by Richard L. Garwin of IBM who, after heading a panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee, concluded that the risks of sonic boom and airport noise would encourage most airports to reject the SST.

My detailed studies of the environmental impact of the proposed jet set toy indicate that it would raise noise levels at airports where it would land and take off even at subsonic speeds. The FAA has also failed to make clear whether or not the supersonic transport would be allowed to fly over the United States. Their ambiguous statements on this question make it clear that once the SST is built they would generate enough pressure to force this aircraft onto domestic routes. The supersonic boom of the SST would be nothing less than a national alarm clock.

I therefore vote "nay" on the motion to recommit, and support the amendment being offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, no one who has ever spent an evening at an outdoor band concert at Watergate, or an afternoon at Hains Point, has to be told that airplane noise can be incredibly annoying. Neither does anyone with an airport in his district who has had to try to explain to his constituents why nobody is doing anything about the jets that come screaming over their homes every day.

Yet here we are today being asked to spend $290 million of the public's money, and perhaps $4 or $5 billion before we are through, to build a plane that will make as much noise around airports as 50 of today's jumbo jets taking off simultaneously.

The Department of Transportation has told us that they do not like us making this comparison. It is "specious" and a "half-truth", they say. But they do acknowledge that the noise around the airport from the SST will be "three to four times as annoying" as that from subsonic jets. That may or may not be 50 jets going off simultaneously, but it sounds pretty bad.

But have no fear, the Transportation Department says, all that noise will be confined to the airport. That sounds plausible, but then they go on to say that they aren't talking about existing airports. As Transportation Secretary Volpe admitted in the appropriations hearings this year "most of the present-day airports are not usable by SST's" because the plane is too noisy. What they are talking about is new airports, and these new airports are going to be way out in the hinterlands, and it is going to take quite a long while to get out to them, probably about the same amount of time as you could save by flying the SST, and so we would be right back to square one in terms of time saved.

The Department also says that a "massive technological effort" might reduce the noise—they do not say who will pay for this massive effort. But the Department's own technical expert, Dr. Raymond Bisplinghof of MIT, said last year that:

> There is very little prospect of bringing the sideline noise down to subsonic transport levels by any practical methods known at the present time.

What this all means is that there is serious doubt that any SST—American, British-French, or Russian—will or should be allowed to land at U.S. airports. They are just too noisy, and the American people should not be asked to put up with them just to get a few people to Paris in time for lunch at Maxim's.

Chairman Russell Train of the Council on Environmental Quality admitted as much in congressional testimony a couple of weeks ago. After testifying that the administration has accepted the principle that the forthcoming FAA noise rules for supersonics "should assure that the noise environment in the vicinity of airports at the time of the introduction of supersonics will not be degraded in any way," Mr. Train went on to say:

> I believe that if we set our standard for the supersonic aircraft in a way which insured that the noise environment in and around our airports will not be degraded, that it will be exceedingly difficult if not impossible for the SST as presently designed and the Concorde as we know it to operate from U.S. airports.

If that is true, Mr. Chairman, neither the American SST nor the British-French Concorde has a chance in the world of being an economic success, and we ought to write an end to at least our part of this foolishness today.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, many of the Members of the House are aware that one of the most pressing problems in America today is that of providing for new and better urban mass transportation systems. Since the enactment in 1964 of the basic urban mass transportation program, Congress has slowly begun to realize the importance that the assistance means to our cities, both large and small. The Subcommittee on Housing, of which I am chairman, conducted extensive hearings earlier this year on the many new proposals to provide additional long term Federal financing for urban mass transportation. Not one witness objected to long term and greatly increased financing for urban transportation systems. Members of the subcommittee unanimously endorsed a proposal to provide $5 billion over the next 5 years for urban mass transportation. Many of us would have liked to see an urban mass transportation trust fund similar to the highway trust fund, but we were unable to reach agreement on the way of financing this trust fund. What we all had in mind was some kind of a firm long term commitment on the part of the Federal Government to provide greatly increased financial support.

I was dismayed by the limitation that the committee has placed which limits the commitments in fiscal year 1971 to $214 million. I was sorry to see in the committee report, language which stated that the Appropriations Committee "does not favor the granting of long term contractual authority by substantive legislation."

This so-called contract authority, which is contained in S. 3154 as approved by the Housing Subcommittee, is perhaps not the most adequate way of providing long-term financial assistance, but it is the one technique which was accepted by all sides. It was the opinion of the members of the subcommittee that before the Secretary of Transportation did enter into any contract with a local transit authority to provide long-term financial assistance, that he would, of course, clear such an action with the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND). We, of course, did not expect the Secretary of Transportation to disregard justifications under this contract authority with the Appropriations Committee. I would hopefully assume that the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation (Mr. BOLAND), would consider additional funds above and beyond the $214 million appropriated in this bill if the Congress passes S. 3154 as amended. And I would also assume that the Secretary of Transportation would come back to the Appropriations Committee to present to the committee the plans that he has to enter into long-term contracts to provide mass transit funds. We want any new spending program such as this new urban mass transportation program to be carefully studied and approved by the Appropriations Committee and we certainly

hope that the Secretary of Transportation will cooperate in this endeavor.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Committee on Appropriation's recommendation to appropriate nearly $290 million in fiscal 1971 to continue development of a supersonic passenger transport aircraft in the United States.

My interest and support of this program may be viewed by some as parochial because the Boeing Co., the airframe developer, maintains a division in Wichita, Kans. I would be the first to acknowledge that I am deeply interested in projects that might help stimulate employment opportunities and the economy of my congressional district.

But my support of the SST program is not purely parochial. I believe we must move forward in this research and development and prototype program because the aviation leadership of the United States is at stake; the SST is the next logical step forward in commercial aviation; and, a successful U.S. supersonic transport program will have considerable impact upon employment, the economy, and our balance-of-payments situation.

We have heard strong arguments advanced this year against funding the program. They range from concern over environmental issues, such as noise and air pollution, to the cost of the program.

I, too, am concerned about the quality of our environment and the need for action to eliminate air and water pollution. On April 13, 1970, I wrote to the Secretary of Transportation concerning questions that have been raised about the impact of the SST on our environment.

In his reply to me on May 7, 1970, Secretary John Volpe said in part:

> You may assure your constituents that the importance of the SST to our aviation leadership, and to the economy of our country, does not in any way obviate our concern for preserving the quality of the environment. For more than six years now, the FAA and other Government agencies have studied the potential environmental effects of SST operations. These studies have significantly influenced the design of the aircraft. For example, the smokeless engines, work on improved noise suppression devices, and emphasis on performance capabilities that will enable the SST to climb out steeply after takeoff and thereby significantly reduce the noise levels over the community are all results of design specifications influenced by environmental concerns.
>
> The contracts for the supersonic transport were also the first to be awarded by the government to include aircraft noise limit requirements. Results of sonic boom studies provided the basis for my recommending to the President that we adopt a policy of prohibiting flights over populated areas at speed that would cause sonic booms to be heard or felt on the ground. A proposed Federal Air Regulation to that effect has been written.
>
> Charges that the SST will pose serious radiation hazards, threaten passengers with injury, or pollute the atmosphere have been examined by competent scientific authorities and reported to be unfounded. Counsel and guidance on these matters have been provided by the Environmental Science Services Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and by other experts in both the Government and industry. . . .
>
> We have recently re-examined the environmental aspects of the program and find no new data beyond that previously considered. We will continue to rely on the technical judgment of competent disinterested authorities outside the Department for guidance as to any other protective measures we should take to assure a fully acceptable program from the environmental point of view.

We should remember that this is a research and development program, and the Government is participating only in the prototype phase of the program. Many of the objections to supersonic passenger flight and the SST can only be resolved by moving ahead with this phase of the program.

The Government's investment in this program is relatively modest compared to our expenditures for space exploration and the approximately $8 billion being expended on research and development for defense this year alone. Yet the spin-off will be substantial.

I share the concern of many in the Congress and in the administration that research and development in aeronautics has been lagging in the United States for some time. The SST program today represents our only advanced aeronautical research and development effort.

The House Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology has emphasized this point, stating that:

> With overall U.S. research and development effort in aeronautics and aviation declining, there is reason for concern about maintaining our long-term world leadership U.S. progress in aeronautical R. & D. has lagged in recent years, and while the manufacturing capability of the Nation is still powerful, the threat of obsolescence and a secondary position exists in a number of areas.

The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, John Shaffer, discussed the state of the Nation's aircraft industry during his testimony before the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee. He pointed out that the backlog in the aircraft industry is $1 billion less than it was a year ago. He suggested the value of continuity and stated:

> The Boeing Company and the rest of the companies likewise, but the Boeing Company specifically, has a very talented engineering and production organization. If we permit that resource or those resources to be dissipated by not affording them an opportunity to participate in and produce what is the next normal step in the evolution of air transportation, then I suggest that that center of excellence can be dissipated or spread to the wind and it will be very difficult indeed to ever reassembled that kind of talent, that sort of organization, and the spirit of that kind of organization.

Therefore, what we are deciding here today is not the prestige of the United States, but whether or not the United States will continue its leadership in aviation by supplying between 80 and 90 percent of the aircraft of the highest quality flying for the airlines of the Western nations.

Earlier, I pointed to the impact of the SST program upon employment, the economy, and our balance-of-payments situation.

Many Members of Congress, including myself, are greatly concerned over unemployment in the aerospace industry. The effect of a halt or a slow-down in the SST program would be a serious blow to the domestic economy.

The prototype development program will provide direct employment for about 20,000 people at peak activity in early 1971, and about half of these people will work for subcontractors and suppliers in States throughout the Nation.

The production program for commercial SST's will employ about 50,000 people at peak production, and another 200,000 will be involved in allied services.

The loss of sales of a U.S. SST, combined with the increased purchase by U.S. airlines of foreign-built supersonics, is estimated to result in an unfavorable swing of about $16 billion in balance of payments through 1990.

Finally, there is the argument of the cost to the Government for this program.

The money being provided by the Government is not a subsidy. It is an investment which will be returned gradually with the sale of the SST.

By the end of this fiscal year, we already will have invested $604 million in this program. With this appropriation for fiscal 1971 amounting to $290 million, the Government will have invested 74 percent of its share.

If we stop now, then our investment will be lost. The taxpayers probably will never recover their share of this investment. The United States will concede its leadership to either the British-French Concorde or the Russian TU–144.

This is the age of the supersonic transport. It is here regardless of the outcome of the American SST program. There always have been those who questioned new developments in all fields of endeavor.

It is interesting to recall that early day railroads also faced opposition.

The Governor of New York wrote the President in 1829 protesting that the trains roared through the countryside, scared the livestock and frightened women and children. He said:

> The Almighty never intended that people should travel at such speed.

The speed was 15 miles per hour.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I fully support the amendment as offered by my colleague, Congressman YATES of Illinois that will delete $290 million for the SST supersonic transport from the Department of Transportation appropriations bill for fiscal year 1971.

In the debate during the last session of Congress on the DOT appropriations bill for fiscal year 1970 I expressed my opposition to the Federal funding of this same project. Last year the Congress appropriated $85 million for the SST and now we are asked to appropriate $290 million for a project that, when completed, may cost the taxpayers in excess of $3 billion.

Based on the evidence available, I cannot support the Federal funding of the SST. This project poses a serious threat to our environment. The SST is likely to create a serious noise pollution to which there is no solution as of the present time. Have we not damaged the quality of our environment enough without adding another pollutant? Should we not be appropriating funds for a better environment?

Mr. Chairman, the administration constantly speaks to the Congress of the need for restraint in Federal spending. At this crucial time I cannot support the allocation of $290 million for the SST when the arguments for this transport plane are outweighed by those arguments against: cost overruns, noise pollution, and high flying risks. Wasteful Government spending, as is the case with the SST, must not be allowed to continue, and therefore I support this amendment to delete all appropriations for the SST for fiscal year 1971.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is ridiculous to consider spending $290 million of taxpayers' money for a supersonic transport jet by turning this money over to private industry in the hope that they can produce a better airplane.

This kind of airplane would produce bigger sonic booms, more noise, air pollution, and possible harmful weather changes. We have other needs in the United States that ought to come first. Millions of Americans spend more time delayed in rush hour traffic tieups than we can ever save by building a faster jet for the jet set.

Mr. UDALL Mr. Chairman, I understand that backers of the supersonic transport plane have had a "truth squad" circulating in the House Office Buildings this week, attempting to dispute the evidence that the SST is a hazard to the environment. This squad, according to report, includes just who we would expect—members of the Department of Transportation and representatives of the companies that would build the SST.

I am pleased that, this year, we have been able to get a more authoritative and independent view on environmental factors from our national environmental "truth squad"—the President's Council on Environmental Quality. The Council was authorized by the National Environmental Policy Act, signed into law only on January 1 of this year. The CEQ was conceived of as a watchdog agency, capable of digging for the scientific facts that tend to be overlooked or ignored by agencies intent on advocating specific projects like the SST.

Two of the three members of the CEQ appeared before the Joint Economic Committee earlier this month. Chairman Russell E. Train and member Gordon J. F. MacDonald testified that the SST poses two major problems—excessive airport noise, and potential climatic change.

In addition, all the major environmental organizations in the United States have considered the SST and found it wanting. I include at this point a list of some of the national organizations who oppose the SST because of the project's environmental impact:

Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.
Consumer Federation of America.
Environmental Action.
Friends of the Earth.
International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union.
Izaak Walton League of America.
National Audubon Society.
National Parks Association.
National Wildlife Federation.
Sierra Club.
The Wilderness Society.
United Auto Workers.
Zero Population Growth.

I emphatically support the Yates amendment and urge its adoption.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, last November I voiced my opposition to the expenditure of $96 million for the supersonic transport, mainly on the grounds that it was an open-ended commitment which did not guarantee a return of the American taxpayers' investment and which posed numerous environmental threats.

Now, 7 months later, despite the President's seeming insistence on noninflationary spending, we are being asked to appropriate three times last fall's expenditure, or $290 million for the SST—even though the concerns of last fall remain unresolved.

On April 22, "Earth Day" was observed throughout this country. The day's lectures and discussions, which focused on ways in which to improve the environment received the overwhelming support of the American people. Yet this Congress is being asked to appropriate funds for a plane which would unquestionably be detrimental to the environment. The SST engines will pollute—and there is strong speculation that its exhaust can effect the balance of heat in the atmosphere and destroy the ozone protecting the earth from highly dangerous radiation. This speculation has received the support of the chairman of the President's Council on Environmental Quality, Russell E. Train.

Furthermore, the noise created by the SST would far exceed the present standards established by the FAA. Dr. Richard Garwin of the President's Science Advisory Board equates the noise produced by a SST taking off to the noise of 50 747 "jumbo jets" taking off simultaneously—and there are presently no proven technological methods of substantially cutting this noise without greatly reducing engine performance.

And then there is the question of the sonic boom produced by the SST. The impact of these shock waves on people and property would be disastrous. Even if the promised regulation confining the supersonic flight of the SST to overwater international routes were enforced, seabirds and water fowl on Arctic and oceanic nesting grounds would receive immeasurable damage, while the economic value of the plane would be severely restricted.

In early May it was revealed that the cost overrun for development of the SST was $76 million last year, $56 million of which must be borne by the Federal Government. Furthermore the Under Secretary of Transportation told the House Appropriations Subcommittee that there is no guarantee that future cost overruns will not occur. The Federal Government is supposedly paying for only the development of the SST prototypes. However there is presently great doubt that private investors will have confidence enough to finance the production of this questionable aircraft.

Yesterday, Washington newspapers carried an article on a probable cutback in airline orders for jumbo jets. Economic conditions simply do not warrant the development of another massive, expensive model of aircraft like the SST. In that case, the Government will be expected to supply guarantee loans, thereby increasing its commitment from $1.283 billion to over $4 billion.

Assuming that the funds necessary for production could be raised through private sources, it would take a sale of 500 SST's for the Government to get its money back with 4-percent interest. The Institute for Defense Analysis, a private economic study group, concluded in a study for the FAA that only 350 SST's could be sold by 1990 if domestic supersonic flight is banned. It is generally acknowledged that domestic flights by the SST at subsonic speeds would not be economical.

In the final analysis the SST's worth fails to justify its huge expense to the taxpayer. The supersonic transport offers the American people only two advantages: speed and prestige. Of what advantage is the expenditure of huge sums for a faster jet when it presently takes me longer to get from my home to the plane—driving on overcrowded roads and waiting in an overcrowded airport—than to fly from Washington to Cleveland? And what prestige can Americans feel over a jet which will pollute and sonically bombard our already defiled environment?

Mr. Speaker, I will vote today to cut this expensive, unsound, and needless subsidy for the SST. The decision to move forward on a supersonic jet can be deferred and held in abeyance until these issues have been cleared. It is more important for our aircraft development to be best rather than first.

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma deserves the support of the House. It seeks to increase funds and make possible needed manpower for the Coast Guard Reserve.

The recommended funds provided by the Appropriations Committee are clearly inadequate for the Selected Reserve, especially in view of the fact that the House has approved a level of strength for the Reserve which could not be achieved under the recommendation.

The Selected Reserve is an integral arm of the Coast Guard, and a most valued and necessary one. It provides needed strength for emergency situations, as experience and testimony document. The proposed 10,000 strength in this appropriation would not make it possible for the Coast Guard to assure the fulfillment of its assignment under any and all circumstances. The strength which can be achieved under the terms of this amendment would, on the other hand, virtually attain the manpower figure which the Coast Guard commandant has stated is the minimal need to fulfill the mission assigned without impairment to the national security.

The amendment deserves our support.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the amendment of our distinguished colleague from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED).

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Department of Defense I, of course, am vitally interested in the operations and proper training and equipping of all of our Reserve Forces, not the least of which is the Coast Guard.

In recent years I obtained the neces-

sary Federal funding to construct a new Naval Reserve training center in my congressional district and, in fact, we dedicated the building not too long ago.

One of the provisions made in the building's interior arrangement was the allotment of the required amount of space for training facilities of our local Coast Guard Reserve unit. This was a wise decision and it has been operating very well.

Though we do not hear quite as much about the Coast Guard and its Reserves, I am sure it is agreed, Mr. Chairman, that it is just as important and vital to our overall national defense posture as any of the other branches of our armed services.

The Coast Guard plays a most important role in the defense picture and we should never forget that fact. Its responsibilities are many and varied—all of them immensely vital to our security.

So, anything we can do for the betterment of the U.S. Coast Guard and its Reserves we should, by all means, do.

These are the reasons, Mr. Chairman, I am most happy to support the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I am in full support of the amendment to the fiscal 1971 Department of Transportation Appropriation, H.R. 17755, to increase the funding for the Coast Guard Selected Reserve so that it can continue to operate at its present level.

Of course, the increase of $8.4 million for a total appropriation of $25.9 million would be consistent with the earlier action of this body when it authorized a Coast Guard Reserve strength of 16,590 with the passage of H.R. 17123. This action, in essence, endorsed the Selected Reserve of the Coast Guard as a vital element in our total defense structure with the unique mission, performed by no other defense component, of port safety and port security, whether in time of war or peace.

Although the Coast Guard Selected Reserve is by law under the jurisdiction of the Department of Transportation in times of peace, however irrational the justification for such organizational arrangement, it is indefensible that an executive agency other than the Department of Defense should be making the critical decisions that concern the continuance or phaseout of this essential defense component.

As has already been aptly pointed out by my distinguished colleague, the Honorable CHARLES W. SANDMAN, JR., New Jersey is proud to have within its boundaries the largest Coast Guard training facility. I gladly associate myself with his remarks when he says that if the training program is deficient, let the training program be improved. There are certainly programs in the Federal bureaucracy that could be improved by eliminating them from the budget, but emphatically, the Coast Guard Selected Reserve is not one of them. I trust that the large majority in this body will vote to affirm their confidence in the selected reserve program by providing the funds necessary to enable this component to improve and sustain its training efficiency so that it can perform its mission as intended.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 145]

Abbitt	Edwards, La.	Patman
Adair	Esch	Patten
Albert	Evins, Tenn.	Pepper
Anderson, Ill.	Fallon	Perkins
Anderson, Tenn.	Foley	Pettis
	Ford, Gerald R.	Philbin
Arends	Friedel	Poage
Ashbrook	Fulton, Pa.	Podell
Ashley	Garmatz	Poff
Aspinall	Gaydos	Pollock
Ayres	Gilbert	Powell
Belcher	Goldwater	Price, Ill.
Berry	Gray	Pucinski
Betts	Green, Oreg.	Railsback
Biester	Green, Pa.	Randall
Blackburn	Griffiths	Rees
Blanton	Hansen, Idaho	Reid, N.Y.
Boggs	Harrington	Reifel
Boland	Heckler, Mass.	Rhodes
Bolling	Hogan	Riegle
Bow	Holifield	Rivers
Brock	Horton	Roberts
Brown, Mich.	Hosmer	Rodino
Burke, Mass.	Hungate	Rogers, Colo.
Burton, Calif.	Ichord	Rogers, Fla.
Burton, Utah	Jarman	Rooney, N.Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Jones, Ala.	Rosenthal
Cabell	Jones, Tenn.	Rostenkowski
Carter	Karth	Roybal
Celler	Keith	Ruppe
Chisholm	Kirwan	Saylor
Clark	Kyl	Scherle
Clausen, Don H.	Landrum	Schwengel
	Lukens	Sebelius
Clawson, Del	McCulloch	Sisk
Clay	McMillan	Smith, Calif.
Cohelan	Macdonald, Mass.	Smith, Iowa
Colmer		Snyder
Conable	MacGregor	Springer
Conyers	Mahon	Stafford
Corbett	Mailliard	Staggers
Corman	Mathias	Stubblefield
Cowger	Matsunaga	Stuckey
Cramer	May	Taft
Culver	Mikva	Teague, Calif.
Cunningham	Miller, Calif.	Teague, Tex.
Daddario	Mills	Tunney
Dawson	Moorhead	Watson
de la Garza	Morgan	Watts
Denney	Morse	Weicker
Devine	Murphy, N.Y.	Whitten
Diggs	Nelsen	Widnall
Donohue	Nichols	Wilson, Charles H.
Dowdy	O'Neal, Ga.	
Dwyer	O'Neill, Mass.	Wold
Edwards, Calif.	Ottinger	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLYNT) having assumed the chair, Mr. EDMONDSON, 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. 17755, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 266 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Transportation, including not to exceed $27,000 for allocation within the Department for official reception and representation expenses as the Secretary may determine; $17,230,000.

WATER AND SEWER FACILITIES PROGRAM

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BARRETT was allowed to speak out of order.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, on Monday, I cosponsored a bill, H.R. 17795, along with the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN), and my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STEPHENS), to increase the authorizations to $1 billion for the basic water and sewer facilities program. When the Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill was on the floor last week, I joined at that time in supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STEPHENS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL) to raise from $150 million to $500 million the funds for grants under this water and sewer facilities program. There is no question that the funds for this vital program are needed all over the country. The Stephens-Widnall amendment that was adopted by the House appropriating $500 million for this program barely covers the backlog of applications that are presently pending in the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

This program which was enacted in the 1965 Housing and Urban Development Act has turned out to be one of the most popular and effective programs in the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Grants are made under this program to help communities, both large and small, construct new water and sewer facilities. All of us are well aware that if we are to make our environment more livable, additional Federal funds are needed to provide the means of financing such programs as new water and sewer facilities. This program is one of the basic government attempts being used to aid in cleaning up the environment. This bill, which, as I have stated, provides for an authorization of $1 billion for the next fiscal year, will give the Congress a chance to really act and not talk about providing assistance to our local communities in their attempts to tackle the pollution problem.

When the Subcommittee on Housing meets in executive session to mark up the Housing bill, I shall work to see that this bill will be acted on favorably.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for the 1971 Department of Transportation appropriation bill. My distinguished colleague from Illinois, Hon. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, and I have been greatly concerned for many months about the serious deficiency of funds confronting the Chicago South Suburban Mass Transit District. The funds in question are necessary for the purchase of seven commuter cars to be used by the Illinois Central Railroad.

The Chicago South Suburban District was originally awarded a grant by the Department of Transportation for the purchase of 130 urgently-needed commuter cars based on estimated cost of

such equipment at the time the proposal was submitted. However, by the time the grant was actually made costs for building the commuter cars had jumped, and the money was sufficient for the purchase of only 123 commuter cars. Thus, the Chicago South Suburban District is left with a shortage of seven commuter cars.

With the daily ridership of commuters reaching as high as 82,000 per day, the need for the seven additional cars is critical. I want to emphasize that these seven commuter cars were part of the original grant and the original bid.

While I realize that the Department of Transportation faces funding limitations at this time, nonetheless, I do feel that the utmost priority should be extended toward allocating the necessary funds to make purchase of these seven commuter cars possible. Further delay will only result in steadily spiraling costs, thus necessitating a far larger allocation of funds later than would be necessary now to complete the purchase of the seven cars.

Consequently, both Mr. Derwinski and I are carefully reviewing page 21 of the committee report which outlines the current status as well as future plans for the urban mass transportation fund.

The Illinois Central Railroad has efficiently and effectively served the commuters in the Chicagoland area for many years, and since the need for the seven cars was acknowledged by the Department of Transportation when the original grant was made, it follows that the allocation of the deficiency funds should be made the first order of business under the urban mass transportation fund.

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. ANNUNZIO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, in supporting the Department of Transportation's appropriation bill this afternoon, I and my colleague from Illinois, the Honorable FRANK ANNUNZIO, are necessarily concerned with funds that might be forthcoming to the Chicago South Suburban Mass Transit District which are necessary to cover a deficiency involved in the purchase of seven cars to be used by the Illinois Central Railroad's suburban line.

Frankly, I recognize the funding limitations that the Department faces at this time and my colleague Mr. ANNUNZIO and I are carefully reviewing page 21 of the committee report outlining the urban mass transportation fund status. I believe that practical priority ought to be allocated by the Department for the particular project which serves our constituents.

May I note, Mr. Speaker, that the Chicago metropolitan area is effectively served by commuter service. The Illinois Central Railroad renders very valuable service to the dozens of communities on the South Side area of the city of Chicago.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of urging my colleagues in the minority who will control the motion to recommit to offer it with a specific deletion of funds for the SST. My reason for asking this is that I am personally opposed to the SST at this time because I think there are much higher priority requirements for our national resources, and I would like a chance to express myself on the record accordingly.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GUBSER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MINSHALL. As a member of the minority, I would like to say to my good friend from California if that possibility does present itself and the parliamentary situation enables me to present a motion to recommit with instructions to delete the SST money. I will make that motion.

There is always the possibility that I will not be recognized, because of House precedents, in defense to a more senior minority member of the appropriations committee but shall have such a motion at the Clerk's desk.

However, there are certainly parliamentary procedures and customs that might prevent me from doing that. I would merely like to say I think this program should be delayed for at least a year under present conditions.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman from Ohio. I certainly hope he does have the opportunity he seeks.

I understand that if the motion to recommit does not specifically include this deletion, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) will ask for a vote against the previous question so that he would then have the opportunity of offering an amendment to the motion to recommit which would delete funds for the SST.

This would be a very difficult situation, because it will be nationally interpreted—and I might add wrongfully interpreted—as a vote on the issue of the SST when, in fact, it is nothing more than a vote on a strictly procedural matter.

Here is where a question of legislative philosophy enters into the problem. We hear a great deal of talk about minorities these days, but let us not forget that there are other minorities than racial. There are political and philosophical minorities as well.

The majority has the numbers, it has the chairmanship of every committee, it has a majority of every committee, and it has a decisive power to which it is entitled because the electorate has bestowed it. One of the powers and one of the checks and balances in our system which is given to the minority so that it can exert a reasonable influence on public policy is the motion to recommit. On at least two occasions within the last week we have seen another, where because of outside interpretation the motion to recommit becomes a vote on an issue instead of a procedural matter. We are about to see another such situation. The sum total of effect is that it takes away from the minority the protection and a right provided under House rules.

It transfers the minorities rightful authority and power to the majority. This is an erosion of fair parliamentary procedure and a dangerous precedent.

I cannot vote against the previous question for these reasons, but I do want to vote against the SST. I cannot adopt the dangerous practice of consistently transferring the rights of the minority over to the majority which already has the overwhelming power to legislate as it sees fit.

I sincerely hope that the minority will give us the chance to record our votes on the specific issue of the SST.

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

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Certainly I am sure, even though I am the ranking Republican on this subcommittee, that if I offer a motion to recommit to delete the SST, the motion would be taken away from me.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I think we might appeal to the sporting blood in the House and let the Members vote on my amendment and then let them vote on a rollcall on the motion to recommit.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, am concerned about the procedure on the motion to recommit. And I commend the gentleman from California for quite rightly pointing out that the majority and the minority are not always identifiable by always obvious outward signs. For example, the minority in this House, year in and year out, on various kinds of amendments to the military procurement bill when it comes before the House, is not a minority consisting of Republicans, and it is not a minority consisting of Democrats, but it is a minority consisting of both Democrats and Republicans who are not given the opportunity to control the motion to recommit.

Mr. Chairman, the story is told of a New England town meeting a few years ago in which a debate took place, the whole town participating, as to whether the community should put limited resources into the building of a new high school or a new bridge across their river. And the controversy raged on into the evening until an elderly gentleman arose and said:

> It seems to me that the issue boils down to this: whether 10 or 15 years from today we want educated citizens going back and forth over an old bridge or ignoramuses going back and forth over a new one.

I hear it said that the development of the supersonic jet transport can take the jet set across the Atlantic in 3½ hours rather than 6½ hours. I also know for a fact that in my city of Indianapolis the 40 special reading teachers in our school system have been cut to 20 special reading teachers, as a consequence of the policy of this Government in limiting Federal aid to education to my community.

Therefore, I believe it is important for this House, for this committee, to deter-

mine whether 10 or 15 years from now it would be better to have a fully educated nation going back and forth over the Atlantic in 6½ hours rather than a nation, which is educationally handicapped, having some of its jet set going back and forth across the Atlantic in 3½ hours.

It is on that basis that I will cast my vote in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) today.

In my judgement, this entire project is a sonic, not to say "boom," dogle.

Oh well, I suppose we cannot do too much for the jet set.

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

Mr. Chairman, I also rise to support the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois. I believe the SST ultimately will be a good thing for this country and for the world community. I believe our scientists and technicians can and ultimately will lick the problem of the sonic boom. Until they do so supersonic craft will not be permitted to be flown at supersonic speeds over U.S. airspace in any event.

I believe we can beat the engine noise problem that will be occasioned by the transoceanic flights that take off westward from the west coast or eastward from the east coast, flights which occasion virtually no passage over land areas, and what there is, at subsonic speeds.

I believe ultimately it will be a good thing for people to be able to travel across the oceans in 3½ hours as against 6½ hours.

We could as readily debunk and ridicule practically every increase in speed in communications and in transportation that has been made since the Stone Age. But the fact is that we have evolved into a modern, technological, sophisticated one world society instantaneous communications around the world, with extraordinarily rapid transportation. Progress in the speed of communication and transportation has always redounded to the benefit of the many; it has never been restricted for the exclusive enjoyment of any small elite. And with all the problems, this progress in the speed of transportation has been a good thing for mankind.

I suspect that one day we will have the SST.

We will have licked the engine noise problem and hopefully we will have licked the sonic boom problem.

It will be a boom for mankind to travel across the oceans at almost twice today's speed.

And I daresay it will affect far more than the jet set when we can travel across the oceans in 3½ hours rather then 6½ hours.

So, in principle, I am totally for the development of supersonic transportation. I know the American people through their Representatives in this House will never, I say never, permit the Congress to go ahead until the program and its operations have been cleansed of any negative environmental or ecological fallouts. This, of course must be an absolute sine qua non; at such time in the future when we proceed with SST development, as ultimately we must and will.

I must say, at this point in time, however, considering not only the education needs of our country, which our colleague from Indiana referred to, but also the vast scope of the unfilled and unmet urban and rural needs of all kinds; the problem of poverty in the midst of affluence; of an education system in many of our Nation's cities that is turning out a generation of functional illiterates; of a national health services delivery system in our country, which place us 17th in the world in infant mortality; the problem of a country with over a million people living in semistarvation, a country that has urban population that is sinking in the mire of cities that are themselves becoming disfunctional, indeed virtually uninhabitable; of a law enforcement system that is so antiquated and to which we have so failed to apply the very science and technology we are seeking to apply here to the supersonic transport, that we seem to be inundated by violent street crime and by an escalation of drug addiction not only among the poor but the middle classes, to which we seem to have no clear answer at all. We certainly have not produced the dollars for residential drug treatment centers which seems to be the one agreed-on facility which makes sense, and for which we have not even begun to find the necessary funds.

So, Mr. Chairman, until we find a way of serving the tens of millions of people in our cities with public services in terms of educational and health services, a welfare program that provides a life that is not demeaning or degrading to the human personality, and provide law enforcement and neighborhood security services that are sensitive, and relevant to the needs, the tensions, and the anxieties, of all elements of our strife ridden cities; until we apply our vast technological and human behavior know-how to the business of keeping our streets and homes safe—until that time comes, Mr. Chairman, I must say with reluctance and sorrow that I for one will vote to let that 6½-hour trip stay 6½ hours for just a little bit longer.

I think we can survive that wait.

I hope the day comes soon when we will get to that 3½-hour transoceanic hop.

I do not deride, or debunk, or mock it.

We ought to pierce that speed barrier someday.

But it has to be at a point in time when we are doing a job for the 200 million plus Americans living and working here on earth—the overwhelming proportion of whom will not be traveling very often across the ocean in 3½ hours' time.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to suggest that we debate the SST when we come to that provision, and I also suggest that the speeches so far have been related to it and we have not come to it.

May the Clerk read?

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman moving to strike the last word?

Mr. YATES. The gentleman does move to strike the last word, and the gentleman has concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVIL SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT

For an additional amount for expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the development of a civil supersonic aircraft, including the construction of two prototype aircraft of the same design, and advances of funds without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), $289,965,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the appropriation for the SST development.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, this is an appropriation for the development of a supersonic aircraft under the terms of a contract between the Government and the Boeing Co. The authorization for the appropriation is admittedly section 312(b) of the Federal Aviation Act, which provides as follows:

The Administrator is empowered to undertake or supervise such development work and service testing as tends to the creation of improved aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers, and appliances.

For such purpose, the Administrator is empowered to make purchases—including exchange—by negotiation, or otherwise, of experimental aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers, and appliances, which seem to offer special advantages to aeronautics.

There is nothing in either provision which authorizes the spending of public funds for private purposes or private gains. There is nothing in either provision which gives the benefits of whatever development or testing is undertaken to the person or the company doing the work. My point here is if the Government pays for the work, as it is in this case, then the Government is entitled to the product. The Government owns the product because it has paid for it. There is no provision in the law which permits gifts or for making grants. That is not the case in this contract because the plane when built will belong to Boeing. Under the contract, whatever results from the development belongs to Boeing, which has the burden of producing the SST. Under the contract the Government is to be repaid for its money through royalties from the sale of planes, but the planes when completed will belong to the Boeing Co. Yet, as I said, there is no authority on the statute books for loans or grants to the contractor.

The second provision of section 312(b) authorizes the purchase of experimental aircraft and various aircraft parts. That provision is not pertinent here as an authorization for this appropriation, because the Administrator is not making a purchase of an aircraft. Pursuant to the terms of the contract, even though the Government is putting up almost all of the funds for the SST, the plane nevertheless will belong to Boeing and not to the U.S. Government. The Administrator is buying no aircraft, no engine, no propeller nor appliances.

There is nothing in the law which permits the Government to give or loan

money to a private contractor to build an aircraft for that contractor. When the Government orders development of a plane like the C–5A or the F–111 or some other aircraft of this type, those planes are developed for the Government. They become Government planes. It is true they are military aircraft but, the fact remains that the same rule should apply to certain planes where the Government puts up the money.

This is the first time that the Federal Government's funds have been used for the development, construction, and production of a commercial aircraft. It is shocking and unfortunate that it is done for the benefit of a private company.

Mr. Chairman, I cite another point which may be used by the proponents of this program in support of the appropriation.

There is a provision in the Organic Department of Transportation Act which gives the Administrator the power to develop and construct a civil supersonic aircraft, but that does not alter my point of order because the authority that is given by that delegation under the Organic Act is limited to developing an SST for the Federal Government. It does not give the Administrator the right to develop an aircraft for a private contractor.

There is no authority in the law for any Government official, there is no authority in the law for the FAA Administrator or for the Department of Transportation to give away the Government's property or to give away the taxpayers' money which is what this contract does. The taxpayers' property is being given for the benefit of the Boeing Co. There is no authority in law for that and there must be such authority before there can be an appropriation in support of that kind of a program.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BOLAND. I do desire to be heard on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the authority for the Government's undertaking this program is crystal clear.

Section 312(b) of the FAA of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1353(b)) states that:

> The Administrator is empowered to undertake or supervise such developmental work and service testing as tends to the creation of improved aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers and appliances.

Nothing in this act in any way excludes the use of cost-sharing contracts to achieve this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, that is point No. 1.

The present DOT authority for this program—section 6(c)(1) of the DOT act, 49 U.S.C. 1655(c)(1)—specifically states:

> There are hereby transferred to and vested in the Secretary all functions, powers and duties of the Federal Aviation Agency, and of the Administrator and other officers and offices thereof, including the development and construction of a civil supersonic aircraft.

Likewise, this present statutory authority for the SST does not exclude or preclude the use of cost-sharing contracts to accomplish a successful SST program.

The contract with the Boeing Co. provides that the Government will have the title to all work paid for by the Government, with the contractor only having a right to that part for which it paid from its own corporate funds. This arrangement guarantees that the Government's rights are fully protected and that the contractor does not obtain title to anything for which the Government has paid.

Therefore, the funds sought in this appropriation bill will go only toward the Government's share in the SST prototypes. The contractors, of course, will pay for their share in the aircraft out of their own funds. Upon completion of the SST program, the Boeing contract provides for a division of all property produced under the contract, based on the proportionate shares of the Government and the contractor.

For these reasons I believe the point of order raised by my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, is not well taken, and ought to be overruled.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to be heard further on this point of order?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if I may be heard further, my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, has made a very eloquent argument, but he has not met the challenge I made in my earlier statement when I said that there must be a specific authorization, there must be a particular, specific provision which gives to the Administrator the power to give away the Government's property. In this case the contract provides for the planes when constructed, if and when constructed, to be owned by the Boeing Co., and for the payment of royalties to the Government for the sale of airframes, for the sale of engines, for the sale of parts, and for the sale of planes. These planes will belong to Boeing. There is a cost-sharing contract up to the time of completion, but at the time of completion those planes will belong to Boeing, and I suggest that there is no authority in law for giving the taxpayers' funds for private benefit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) raised the point of order against the appropriation appearing on page 2 of the bill, entitled "Civil Supersonic Aircraft Development," on the ground that there is no authorization in law for the development of such an aircraft, and for the expenditure provided herein.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) in responding to the point of order has cited certain provisions of law which have been recognized by the gentleman from Illinois as pertaining directly to the authorization of the civil supersonic aircraft development program.

The Chair has examined the laws to which attention has been directed. Chapter 20 of title 49, United States Code, relates to the Federal aviation program of the Federal Government, and sets forth the powers and duties of the Federal Aviation Agency and, as has been pointed out, empowers the Administrator to "undertake or supervise such developmental work and service testing as tends to the creation of improved aircraft. For such purpose, the Administrator is empowered to make purchases—of experimental aircraft."

Even broader, I think, is the delegation of authority that appears in Public Law 89–670, establishing the Department of Transportation. Section 6(c)(1) of that act states as follows:

> There are hereby transferred to and vested in the Secretary (of Transportation) all functions; powers, and duties of the Federal Aviation Agency, and of the Administrator and other officers and offices thereof, including the development and construction of a civil supersonic aircraft.

The Chair has heard the argument of the gentleman from Illinois with reference to his contention that this must be construed narrowly, but does not find in the law or in the precedents any requirement for as narrow a construction as the gentleman has contended for. It is a broad delegation of authority, and must not be construed as narrowly as the gentleman has sought.

In view of these citations, which give the Secretary a broad experimental and development authority and bestow upon him in explicit terms the authority to develop and construct a Civil Supersonic Aircraft, the Chair is constrained to overrule the point of order.

Therefore the point of order is overruled.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: Strike out lines 20 through 25 on page 2 and lines 1 and 2 on page 3.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, my amendment will strike out the funds for the SST. The reason I offer it is that I am impressed by the utter uselessness of the SST program at this time.

In a day when enormous problems weigh in upon us from all sides, and when deficits in the Federal budget by the President are announced rather than a surplus—of what possible use to the American people does this kind of expenditure have?

We are told that the Russians are flying their Tupelev and the British and the French are flying their Concorde. I say, so what? Who benefits by the flights of the British and the French and the Russians of their supersonic aircraft?

It is said that this gives them an advantage. That it will allow people, their passengers, to get from New York to Paris in 3 hours instead of 6 hours. Big deal.

Let me cite an article written recently by James J. Kilpatrick in the Washington Star entitled "Who Needs the SST—Not the Airlines or the Public."

Mr. Kilpatrick cited a statement by Secretary of Transportation John Volpe in which he said:

> The appeal contained at least a demi-semi-quaver of desperation. "The aviation industry is essential to our Nation," Volpe

said. If the SST should be dropped, "then in 6 or 7 years you would have tens of thousands of employees laid off and an aviation industry that would go to pot."

Volpe also renewed a number of other arguments in support of the SST: Its sale would help our balance of payments. A successful SST would boost American prestige. And as for the problem of the plane's sonic boom, there would be no problem: The plane would never be permitted to fly at supersonic speeds over land.

This is what Mr. Kilpatrick says:

A more specious line of reasoning seldom has been assembled. For the taxpayers to invest another $290 million in this venture—and that is the sum to be asked this week—would be a throwing of good money after bad boondoggles. Do we learn nothing from such wretched experiences as the military F-111? Do we ever examine all the implications of "progress?"

May I interject, Mr. Chairman, to point out that for the first time, we have an overrun in this program now. There was a $76 million overrun for the first time. That is the first time and there will be many more to come.

The limitation that President Kennedy had placed on the SST program when he launched it in 1963 saying that there would be no more spent of the taxpayers money than $750 million. Has now gone to twice that amount.

The figures now project to $1,400,000,000 for certain. And if you read the testimony before our committee, you will see that if private contractors cannot obtain the financing for this plane, the taxpayers may be called upon to spend another $4 billion to $5 billion before you get a commercial transport supersonic plane.

Do you think President Kennedy would have approved the SST in the first instance if he had known that the SST program would cost five times more than the limit he established for the SST program? Of course, he would not.

It is stated that insofar as the infernal racket that this thing makes—and everybody concedes it is an infernal racket from the sideways noise of this plane.

The FAA says:

We are going to avoid this by building airports in remote areas.

Well, apart from the billions of dollars that go into the construction of the new SST airports, what does it gain a passenger on an SST plane to have a few less hours in the air when he has to travel an additional hour on the ground or an hour and one-half on the ground to get to an urban center from some remote airport?

The arguments in favor of this program are truly specious.

It will be stated that we have all gone through this argument before, that we have faced this year after year, that it has been 7 years that we have had the program. Mr. Chairman, that may be true, but for the first time the facts about this program are becoming known. Read the testimony in our hearings by Dr. Garwin, and you will see the strict requirements of the initial contract, the initial SST contract, are being downgraded. No longer will we have the same kind of plane that had been planned at first.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of my amendment and defeat of this appropriation.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

In the last analysis, what the gentleman's amendment to strike out funds for the SST would do, is relegate the United States to a second-class position in the air transportation field.

Technologically, we have enjoyed supremacy in the civilian air transport field, but it has been hard earned. Eighty percent of the air fleets of foreign nations are American planes, designed by American engineers, built by skilled American workmen.

As a member of the House Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology, I have heard the testimony of our scientists. I have heard of our successes of the past in engine noise abatement and air pollution control.

With subsonic planes, each new generation of engines has shown the results of our research and development. For example, the 747 is quieter than the 707.

So it will be with the SST.

Those Members of this House who oppose the SST have a good political thing going for them. They exploit the objections and fears of environmentalists.

Mr. Chairman, I will hold my record in environmental control legislation against any of them. I have fought for less noise. I have fought for cleaner air. I have and I will continue to fight for rigid environmental standards.

But, this amendment would kill the SST program. It would bring to a halt one of the last items built in America which, because of our scientific superiority, has never been priced out of the world market.

Members of this body who represent industrial areas—steel and automobile manufacturing—know what I mean. Japan and Germany are underselling us.

Now, however, if the Congress defeats this amendment, as was done last year by a 2-to-1 majority, research can continue to assure that the SST will not only be built, but that research will assure a reduction in its air and noise pollutants.

What is needed is proper standards; not to revert to the horse-and-buggy days.

On the one hand, Mr. Chairman, we can ignore the 850,000 workers employed in the aircraft industry. We can forget the 115,000 new jobs for Americans in the consumer and service industries related to the SST. We can deplete our economy of the American dollars to be gained, the $130 billion of export business to be gained from 1975 to 1990.

We can, on the other hand, spend $5.6 billion to buy foreign SST aircraft, and thereby we can lose the $2 to $3 billion a year benefit to our balance of payments.

Finally, it should be remembered that this is not a bonanza for any one congressional district or any one State or any one company.

There is an assembly line in my State, but the contract for the engines has gone to a different company, and subcontracts and the jobs they will require are in 32 other States.

Despite the emotional moves now taking place to kill the SST, and the things that are being said in the heat of this debate, the Federal Aviation Administration considers the SST to be of a very good design.

At present it has a lower takeoff and landing noise profile than present subsonic jets and requires about as much runway length as the conventional DC-8 and 707 jets.

Mr. Chairman, I sum up by quoting the words of former FAA Administrator and now president of Pan American World Airways, who said:

The supersonics are coming, as surely as tomorrow. You will be flying one version or another by 1980 and be trying to remember what the great debate was all about.

Mr. Chairman, the SST must be engineered and built in America.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Does the gentleman know what else Mr. Halaby said?

Mr. Halaby called the Concorde's cabin "restricted." He said its passengers, after the comfort of wide-bodied jets such as the Boeing 747, would feel they were going "back to the tube from the living room." With only 122 seats in the cabin, he feared that Concorde fares would have to be so high that the plane would be limited to expense-account travelers. Beyond that, he raised a number of technical points about accessibility of components for maintenance, noise beyond the problems of sonic boom, and smoke emission.

Mr. Halaby was the first one to criticize these programs, so I think the gentleman must accept his earlier statements in the light of his later ones.

Mr. PELLY. If the gentleman wants to find someone to quote on either side of this issue, there is plenty of documentation, but the fact is that we will either have American workmen building a plane designed by American engineers, or we will have foreigners building this plane. I am all for American industry.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) to delete the appropriation of $290 million for continued development of the civil supersonic aircraft. I have already joined with others who serve on the House Appropriations Committee to set forth our separate views in opposition to this proposed expenditure. The basic reasons for our opposition are both economic and environmental.

This proposed expenditure cannot be justified by any public need because a very small percentage of the Nation's population will ever have the financial

means or the opportunity to use the supersonic transport. If the noise control and sonic boom control regulations issued by the Department of Transportation are applied as written and enforced, the SST will not be able to operate from airports in the United States. Even if the regulations are modified, few airports in this country could accommodate the SST and the noise problem at airport communities would be intolerable.

These facts certainly go to the heart of the economic feasibility of making this program a success and cause grave concern about the wisdom of approving this kind of Federal expenditure. In order to justify economically the continuation of a supersonic aircraft development program, prior to completion of further research activity, the Department of Transportation would have to compromise its position on environmental control and subject residents of airport communities to a noise barrage beyond our ability to predict or control and these must be our first consideration. I submit that those who support this appropriation have not justified the program or the size of the appropriation and I urge my colleagues to vote to strike this item from the bill.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois, who was quoting the chairman of the board of Pan American World Airways, failed to add the one last sentence to the story: He bought the airplane.

I think it is interesting to notice how the debates of the last few years on the SST have developed. About 3 years ago everybody was talking about the sonic boom; now it has been absolutely stated by FAA to all the supporters and opponents of the SST that the SST simply will not be allowed to fly over populated areas at supersonic speeds.

Then we come up to the approach and takeoff noise of the SST. The engine developers and the airframe manufacturers have given their expert opinion that 1 mile out from the runway or 3½ miles out from the runway, which is the primary populated area—very few people live within 1 mile of the runway of the major airports except in areas like Washington National, where certainly the SST will not be allowed.

We find that not only is the SST acceptable on the climb out and approach distances, but the projected noise is less at the 1 mile and less than the 3 miles with the Boeing 707.

Now to clarify the matter of the runways and the airports, we just got through reporting from our committee and reporting from this House and from this Congress—and signed by the President—the Airport and Airways Construction Act. I did not notice anything in that Airport and Airways Construction Act that was tailored just to the SST.

The great problem of the congestion that is caused by the aircraft is caused primarily by the jumbo jets such as the 707 and the 1011 and the DC-10's that will all be flying soon, as the 707 is today. So we are going to have to get our major airports away from the population centers whether there is or there is not an SST, and I am sure all on both sides agree to that.

Now I want to correct some inaccurate statements concerning the necessity of changing the whole runway and rearranging of runways and what have you.

The Boeing 707 requires a runway of 11,100 feet to take off.

The Douglas DC-8, requires a runway length of 12,600 feet to take off.

The SST—and that includes the Concorde or the Boeing; and I have seen the Concorde take off at the small Le Bourget Airport in Paris—requires only 10,540 feet.

As to the thickness of a runway required as an absolute minimum, all American major airport runways are at least 50 percent thicker than required today.

The DC-8 requires a minimum thickness of 13.2 inches. The Boeing 707 requires a minimum thickness of 12 inches even. The SST requires a minimum thickness of 12.9 inches, which is between the other two.

These are some of the questions which have been brought up about some of the statements which have been made.

To close, we have, fortunately, as a result of some misfortune, been able to have quite a bit of extra time in developing the engine itself. The SST engine over at Cincinnati has been complete for well over a year, for about 15 months. This time has been taken and taken well for noise suppression.

There is a question as to the noise in the immediate vicinity of the airport. A person who comes out to the airport to leave on a plane, as those of us who have been around the major airports know full well, does not go out there to take a nap, and does not go out there to spend the night. The way the new airports are being built today, a person walks through a tunnel or a port, not exposed to the outside air, into almost all of the airplanes.

In the one year or more since the GE engine has been complete they have been able to bring the noise level down from over 130 decibels to 123 at the present time, and they have every reason to believe that this will be lowered to 112 by the time the airplane is off the production line.

I close with this one point: I saw the first time the 747 took off from a European airport. This huge, lumbering giant——

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Yates amendment.

The SST could not have come up on a worse day in our history.

The taxpayers' revolt is still in full cry. We are having a 7.2-percent annual inflation. A million men and women are unemployed as a result of current economic policies who would not otherwise have been. We have the highest interest rates in 100 years. The Wall Street stock market is a shambles.

Yet the taxpayers are mocked by this flying dodo of a bird that would impose $290 million of additional taxes on them this year.

I cannot think of a better day, Mr. Chairman, to kill a mockingbird.

Whom is the SST going to benefit? Certainly not the average American taxpayer. He is never even going to ride in the SST. Two or three percent, at most, of the people of this country are ever going to ride in the SST, if it flies. And they are going to be the jet setters who will have the dubious advantage of being able to fly from New York to Paris in a few hours less, and of being able to eat dinner at the Ritz in Paris before they have stopped chewing the breakfast at the Waldorf in New York.

The effects on their internal economy are going to be second only to the effects on the internal economy of this country.

What about the airlines?

The former head of the FAA, Mr. Quesada, now a director of American Airlines, testifies that the airlines wish the SST would just go away.

I sympathize with the position of Boeing, and of the Northwest area. But how much better it would be for the people of this country if the talents of the men who work at Boeing were put to work making air pollution equipment, water pollution equipment, or mass transit vehicles, subsidized by the Government, if you will, than for them to achieve the supersonic socialism embodied in the SST.

Let there be an end today to the SST. Let the FAA tell the French, the British, and the Russians that they cannot fly their monstrosities in this country. That will end the prestige argument once and for all.

And then let us get on with solving the great economic and social problems of this country.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) to delete all funding for the supersonic transport—SST—and want to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin. I do not think this is a period when our economy can afford large expenditures on items like the SST, not only because there are so many items which have a higher priority, but because of the destructive environmental impact of this plane.

The House of Representatives in considering the SST appropriation today is facing the first real test of its commitment to the principles of Earth Day, held barely a month ago. It is easy enough to make a speech at home or on the floor of the House extolling the need to do something about the environment, but rhetoric is going to accomplish little; only action is going to secure action.

Earth Day was dedicated to taking stock of the defilement of our environment through the pollution of our lakes and streams, the fouling of the atmosphere and the increasing bedlam of noise dinning our ears. It was dedicated as well

to securing a reversal of our distorted priorities by which we encourage with Government funding technology which pollutes the environment and do little to encourage the kind of technology which does not.

The SST represents all that runs counter to the principles of Earth Day. It will contribute significantly to the pollution of our environment; and it will divert badly needed resources from uses which could clear up pollution and wipe out other domestic problems of this country.

I oppose the SST because it would be a major source of airport noise. According to Russell Train, the Chairman of the President's Council on Environmental Quality, the SST will produce a "high level of noise in the vicinity of airports." The current design of the SST will lead to a noise field radiated perpendicular to the runway, called sideline noise. In terms of measures used by the Federal Aviation Administration—FAA—to assess annoyance, the SST would be three to four times louder than current FAA sideline standards, and four to five times louder than the 747. In terms of noise pressure, the sideline noise level would also be substantially higher than that of subsonic jets meeting FAA requirements.

Dr. Raymond Bisplinghoff, dean of MIT School of Engineering and chairman of the SST Technological Evaluation Committee, formed last year by FAA to review the plane, said much the same thing in testimony before the House Appropriations Committee last year. He said:

> The SST will produce as much noise as the simultaneous takeoff of 50 jumbo jets satisfying the subsonic requirement.

I oppose the SST because implausible as it may appear, the SST may modify weather conditions. Russell Train points out that the transport flying at 60,000 to 70,000 feet may affect the water vapor and destroy the shielding capacity of the atmosphere at that level against penetrating and potentially highly dangerous ultraviolet radiation. This would also have the effect in a few years of leading to a sun shielding cloud cover with serious consequences to climate.

Clearly the effects on the atmosphere are of importance to the entire world and should be thoroughly understood before any country proceeds with a massive introduction of supersonic transports. It makes no sense to me to go ahead with the SST until we have some way of knowing what its long-range environmental impact will be.

Finally, I oppose the SST because it is a waste of our monetary resources. We recently approved a housing appropriation bill that allocated significantly less for housing this year than has been allocated in years past. Earlier this year, the President vetoed an educational appropriation bill because he said our economy could not afford the burden of the added expenditure. The appropriations under the poverty program have also been significantly reduced. It is a distorted sense of national priorities which can permit this to occur and yet approve continued expenditures on a plane what may well end up costing the Government $5 billion, represents a significant source of noise pollution and may adversely alter the weather and our climate.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons, I urge the adoption of the amendment to delete all funding for the SST.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I want particularly first, Mr. Chairman, to answer the argument of the gentleman from Wisconsin with regard to the economics of this matter. This is not an inflationary package in that it is one of the very few things we appropriate money for where it will eventually produce the production facilities and goods in the United States which do not have an inflationary impact.

I might also state that this leads to the employment of individuals, and at the present time we have one of the highest rates of unemployment in the United States that we have suffered in a number of years.

This is a different type of expenditure than one where goods go out of the United States and are never used. These goods turn over as part of our economy. Unless we do this, in the 1970's and 1980's those employed in the aerospace industry, in commercial aviation will be reduced to less than 150,000. Remember we cut the space program and cut the military program and other programs in which these people work so the whole industry is staggering. The employment will drop from 200,000 people employed now to 150,000 people in the mid 1970's even if you have an SST program and will go down to less than 80,000 people if you do not have it. We will be moved out of the commercial jet market.

We will also have no fallout from the development of new products in the aerospace industry. The development of the Concorde, which has taken place in England, is also helping with their A-300 skybus which competes with the Lockheed and Douglas skybus-type planes.

I mention this because there are solid economics involved and this is one program from which the Government will be repaid. This is one of the few programs where we have an investment of our money where the money will come back in to us. This is the sort of thing that the U.S. Government should be doing. I am here today as a matter of conscience and economics. The depression that is now occurring in my area, for example, which is all commercial and not military at all, shows that in the last 2 years we have gone from 100,000 people employed to 60,000, and that will drop down to 50,000 in the near future unless we have a change. You have to have jobs and you have to have people paying taxes in order to run the programs that I want to support in this House. When my people in my area and in yours go out of work, somebody will have to take care of them with programs for welfare, unemployment, compensation, and poverty programs. We should try to build these peacetime industrial programs, because it will give our people a chance to work for a living and then we can have these other programs that we are all for.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I, like many other Members, have had a number of letters in opposition to the SST proposal. I am wondering if the gentleman can respond to some of these questions. They fall into general categories, some of which you have already responded to. They say that the funds should be used for more pressing domestic problems, including that of our environment. How would you respond to that?

Mr. ADAMS. I think we should be improving our environment and funds should be appropriated for that purpose, also.

But the environmental problem caused by the SST is minimal compared to the total problem we are trying to solve, for example, with the air pollution from the automobile. This plane will not cause a great environmental problem in spite of some of the scare things that have been said about the upper atmosphere. This plane will fly at an altitude of 60,000 feet and in the opinion of most experts will not have an undue adverse effect on the upper atmosphere.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the next question is this: There is concern over the sonic boom problem and its effect on fish and wildlife as well as its effect on flying the aircraft over land.

How does the gentleman respond to that kind of question?

Mr. ADAMS. The routes that have been established for the SST—and it has been stated repeatedly by those who have advocated this program, including all the governmental agencies involved—that there will not be any overland routes over the United States. There will be routes over the Arctic icecap and over the oceans and there have not been shown to be harmful effects there. The British, the French, and the Russians are flying these routes now and will be flying their planes over parts of the United States whether we authorize this program or not.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I have one final question:

Why should the Government be involved in financing the SST? Why should not the private companies finance the program?

Mr. ADAMS. The problem is that the design and development cost of this kind of program will run over $1 billion which outstrips the ability of any and all of the aircraft industry to pay. They simply do not have the equity capital and could not borrow the capital to do this.

This has been true in the United States for many years, but in the past the Government was engaged in the development of military aircraft. That has been greatly slowed in the United States, however, and particularly in the heavy high speed transport planes. Many of us think this is unfortunate. So, if there is no SST development assistance on the part of the Government, then the other countries which are subsidizing airplane development such as the Russians, the

French, the German complex, and the Japanese complex will develop the next generation of jets both supersonic and subsonic and will take that market and we will be out of business.

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

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) Mr. ADAMS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have this one final question that relates to the engines that will be used by the aircraft itself. There is a concern over the amount of pollution that would come from the engine that is used in the SST. Is the gentleman concerned, personally, and could the gentleman advise me and the other Members of his views on this matter?

Mr. ADAMS. The FAA started in 1969 and they now have a staff of over 12 people here alone putting out standards and checking these engines as well as checking the present engines of jet aircraft for both noise and to reduce the pollutant factor. They have worked down the decibel factor very significantly and they also are working on the intakes and on the outages to try to reduce to a minimum the amount of pollution that is produced by these engines. In an industrial society we have this pollution problem across the board with reference to most of our industries and particularly with reference to the automobile. The airplane industry and especially the supersonic jet, is a tiny tail on that particular very big dog of air pollution.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and for the passage of this bill. I say this because I believe we are in the supersonic age, whether or not we wish to recognize it. As a Congress, we should recognize the fact that we will have to keep up with what is going on in the world. If we do not, other nations will take the leadership from us and the first thing we know we will be a second-rate nation. I do not want this to happen.

Mr. Chairman, we have just passed an airport bill authorizing more than $5 billion over the next 5 years which will help to make space available for these planes to land and to take care of the noise problem.

I think we are building up a lot of fears that should not be brought up at this time until we know something about the facts. If we do not, other nations will take advantage of this and we will have to buy their products.

Mr. Chairman, we have already put a lot of money into the supersonic program. Are we going to let those funds and the knowledge go down the drain and depend upon someone else or are we going to proceed with the genius and brains we have to produce this SST and make it a paying proposition?

I do not believe there is a Member of this Congress who does not want to see America continue on as it always has done, to press on to greater things, and to do the very best that we can. I think that America can produce this plane, and can regain and maintain the leadership in this field. I think, in the future, if we do not carry on, we will find it necessary to yield to the other countries and we will be just second best. I believe we should always remember that motto of America, that we should continue to press on, not to go backward, but to move forward, try to do better, and try to do the very best with what we have.

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

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) for yielding. I want to commend my colleague from Illinois (Mr. YATES), for his leadership in offering this amendment to eliminate funds for further development of the Supersonic Transport—SST, and to indicate my strong support for his amendment.

I have opposed further involvement by the Federal Government in the development of this aircraft at every opportunity for some time. Experts disagree on the exact cost to the Government of this project, but it is clear that the cost is excessive in view of the competing needs of the Nation. President Nixon has indicated he does not intend to spend more than $750 million for the SST, but if the contractors cannot obtain outside financing for production of the aircraft once it is developed, the Government would have little choice but to make further investments which could escalate to as much as $5 billion. In the development stage alone, severe cost overruns have begun to appear. $76 million in cost overruns have occurred in the last 6 months, $57 million of which have had to be assumed by the Government.

The indirect costs of this project are likely to be even more serious than the direct ones. Typically, Government and private industry planners and developers have chosen simply to ignore or even deny the indirect costs that the American public is likely to have to pay for a Supersonic Transport plane. One major indirect cost will surely be imposed upon our already overburdened natural environment. Authoritative testimony has been received which indicates that the noise level of the SST at takeoff would be equal to the simultaneous takeoff of 50 jumbo jets. The operation of the projected fleet of 500 SSTs and Concordes—the French version of the Supersonic Transport—could very well, over a period of years, change the water and gas content of the atmosphere to such an extent that the world's climate would be noticeably modified.

As the gentleman from Illinois has rightfully pointed out in his separate views to the Appropriations Committee report on this legislation, the Environmental Policy Act of 1969, which I cosponsored and strongly supported, requires that all agencies of the Federal Government include in every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation a precise statement on the projected impact of the legislation on the environment. The Department of Transportation has indicated that it intends to submit such an environmental report sometime before the end of calendar year 1970. However, by that time, nearly $300 million more will have been spent on the development of this aircraft. Such a situation is outrageous. Certainly no more funds should be appropriated or expended until this report has been received and evaluated.

I feel strongly that the needs of our cities, the needs of the environment, the needs for improved urban mass transit and social services greatly outweigh the need for the SST, and that the benefits from the investment in these social projects will greatly outweigh any benefits in prestige or wealth we might obtain from development of this gigantic metal albatross. I, therefore, urge the Members of this House to join me in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois striking all funds for the SST from the fiscal year 1971 transportation appropriation bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to strike out funds for the SST. I know there are many Members of the House who do not represent constituencies which have large airports in their districts, and thus do not have the problem of jet noise, or the problem of jet noise may not be as immediate as it is to some of us who do represent areas that do have large airports. When you get off an airplane at O'Hare Field you are practically in my district so my constituency is particularly sensitive to the problem of jet noise throughout the day and at night.

We have heard a lot of statements being made here today about how in 7 years they will lick this noise problem, and they will lick the sonic boom problem, but there has been a great deal of contradiction. On the one hand they say, well, these airplanes will not fly at supersonic speeds overland, and then we hear another statement being made that they will not fly over largely populated areas. Then we heard another statement made here that the noise will be at its maximum 3.5 miles from the runway threshold, and that it will be tolerable beyond that, that jet noise from the SST will be actually less than the 707, the 727, and the 747.

Well, for those of you who do not live with this problem every day, I want to tell you something about jet noise from airplanes. You can take an area 15 miles away from the runway threshold and on takeoff you still have a very serious jet noise problem.

I hope that this committee will realize that at some point in time when sonic booms start criss-crossing America and when the lives of millions of Americans are adversely affected, somebody is going to say how did we ever get into this? You will have to reply, we got into it because Congress kept adding a couple of hundred million dollars every year for SST development until you reached a point of no turning back. And, of course, that is exactly how we got to spend $790

million already. We heard the statement made earlier by the gentleman from Massachusetts who said, well, you have already got $790 million invested in this SST, so you cannot turn back.

This SST will run into the billions of dollars. As my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, said earlier, this is going to be one of the biggest boondoggles we have ever seen for the taxpayers' money. There are going to be overruns, because the overruns are here already.

And so at some point in time citizens are going to say "How in the world did we get to this point?" Well, I can tell you right now there are many who will not be able to answer that question. As you continue to pour more and more dollars into this project you get further and further away from the day when you can still kill it.

I am not at all persuaded by the arguments that somehow or other speed is necessary. We are just now getting the 747's out of the assembly line. The 747's are going to be good planes for many years to come as a result of the investment by the airline industry. I do not agree with all these statistics here, about how the United States is going to look poorly in international commerce, because the fact remains that if the Concorde and the Soviet planes do not meet the minimum noise standards which I hope the FAA is going to set, they are not going to be permitted to fly in this country.

We hear a great deal about the Soviet plane, but has anybody actually seen the Soviet plane break the sonic barrier? The Russians tell us that it has. We have been hearing the Russians tell us a lot of things they claim they have been doing. The fact of the matter is I do not think the situation is at all as critical as the supporters have tried to make it out. I would much rather this Congress said here, today, "Stop, we are not going to go any further until you people give us some assurances that you can contain the sonic boom, that you can design an airfoil that will be able to fly at supersonic speeds without creating sonic booms."

The gentleman asked a little while ago what effect this will have on wildlife and animals. Do not kid yourselves. All you have to do is to read the reports of the Air Force of the effect of the sonic boom in Oklahoma City and other places on wildlife, cattle, and on people themselves.

I hope no one believes we can eliminate the sonic boom by 1978 or that we are going to avoid this in the United States, they say to you—well, listen, vote for this because they are not going to fly over land masses. If they had to divert all the way down beyond Mexico, they will have eliminated all the advantages of the speed of supersonic flight.

So I am telling you right now, I think we ought to adopt this amendment and serve notice on the industry that we will move forward only when we have the assurance that they can contain the problem of noise and sonic booms in the SST.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

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

Mr. RYAN. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, the civil supersonic aircraft development appropriation of $289,965,000, proposed in the Department of Transportation appropriation bill before us today, causes me to wonder whether the true transportation needs of our Nation are being served by the total SST program.

Considering the serious transportation crisis facing our metropolitan areas, the threatening air and noise pollution problems and the galloping inflationary course of our economy, I question the relevancy of a Government expenditure of this magnitude for a program that poses so many environmental, technical, and financial hurdles.

Close to three-quarters of a billion dollars in Federal subsidy money has already been spent on SST development—a project that started in 1960 and is still nowhere near completion. Now we are asked to approve another whopping $290 million addition to this already enormous public expenditure.

It seems, Mr. Chairman, the American taxpayer will continue to be tapped again and again for a project that promises less and less every year.

The ultimate cost to our citizens may well reach three or four times the originally estimated figure before the SST becomes operational. This is a financial burden we cannot impose on the American public. Our people are already suffering from the destructive effects of an overextended economy in which our national priorities have been terribly distorted.

Can we, in good conscience, spend only $106 million on air pollution control and $204 million on mass urban transportation while at the same time appropriate almost twice this combined amount on a project that detracts from both these programs?

Mr. Chairman, this is clear evidence that our priorities are twisted and it is time for us to reassess our national goals and objectives.

The SST, it is claimed, will eventually enable travelers to cross the Atlantic in less than 3 hours. Those people interested in cutting 4 hours off a flight to Paris must decide whether the gain is worth the per capita costs. They must also determine whether the induced diseconomies of the SST—such as air and noise pollution, sonic boom, jammed air traffic patterns, crowded airport facilities, and an extended Federal budget—are worth the few hours saved per trip to Paris.

Even if individual decisions are affirmative, we as a nation must measure the per capita benefits to be derived from the SST venture. It occurs to me that only a small part of our total population will see a need for SST flying within the next decade. Yet, almost all our citizens are now in need of better surface and subway mass transportation conveyances.

The people of my congressional district in the north Bronx and south Yonkers are seriously concerned with the lack of adequate—and in some cases the total absence of—everyday travel facilities. For many of these people, it now takes 2 to 3 hours to get to work every day. Yet we are talking today about a 3-hour trip between New York and Paris. The inconsistency is astounding and I will not perpetuate it by supporting the SST appropriation in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, when we are able to solve our local transportation problems, when we can breathe fresh air again, when aircraft noise abatement especially near our airports is a reality, when our ground airport facilities are adequate, when our economy returns to a stable level, then will I support SST development. Until then, I am compelled to urge my colleagues to reject the appropriation for the SST development program.

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

Mr. RYAN. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) is doing a brilliant job in this discussion. For one thing, people keep saying things that are beside the point, and he keeps trying to focus on the point, or rather on the points. For instance, the point is not whether the SST will be noisier in the air, but how we can afford to subsidize an airplane, of all things, considering all the things we are told we cannot afford to subsidize that are needed so urgently. And the point is, why should a plane that will add substantially to the volume of ground noise in communities that are already suffering terribly from noise—even if it were not a subsidized plane—why should that kind of plane be permitted to fly over or land near such communities at all?

Is it really very sensible to make all the people pay a great deal of money so small numbers of people can fly somewhere faster at the price of even greater inconvenience to large numbers of people on the ground? And is it really rational to do this knowing that even those who would be able to fly somewhere faster will not get where they are going any quicker, since ground transportation will take longer in the worse traffic jams that will pave the way to the new airports we are told will be located further from metropolitan centers?

In short, Mr. Chairman, will someone explain who needs the SST and why? It is clear who does not need it, and that is an awful lot of people to ignore when it is their money you are spending.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Yates amendment.

For the SST is really a benchmark in the struggle to redirect our national priorities.

The fiscal year 1971 appropriation bill for the Department of Transportation and related agencies—H.R. 17755—provides $289,965,000 for the SST. This is the full amount requested by the administration.

While I want to address the specific

ills of the SST program, I first want to stress the larger issues which this program very much raises. These issues, which have been sloughed over in prior years with insufficient consideration by the majority of the Members of this House, cannot continue to be ignored.

The concern for redirecting our national priorities has grown greater as our economy has increasingly been wracked by the expense of conducting the war in Indochina, and as the needs of our domestic society consistently have been neglected. In light of this concern, and the neglected needs of our society which urgently compel this concern, I can think of no more misguided use of funds than for the SST program.

The committee is recommending an appropriation of approximately $290 million. This exceeds by $110 million the amount requested for Job Corps. At Job Corps' per man-year cost goal of $5,200, this $290 million would pay for 55,750 young men and women to be trained in Job Corps. Or it could be used to pay for 644,444 youths in the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer program, in which costs are figured at approximately $450 per youth.

This $290 million could be used to fill 10 percent of the monumental $3 billion backlog in applications for urban renewal project funds which are currently pending in the Department of Housing and Urban Renewal. Or it could be used to increase by more than one-third the administration's inadequate $800 million 1971 request for funds to combat water pollution. Or it could be used to almost quadruple the total amount requested by the administration for air pollution control—a request which now amounts to only $106 million.

I think it eminently evident that there are potential uses for these funds which can quickly and directly address the real needs of our Nation. In no way does an expenditure on the SST work for the alleviation of the enormous problems which we face.

But, actually, this $290 million is only a drop in the bucket. The total Government commitment has risen to $1.366 billion, of which $708 million has thus far been obligated. Thus, we are really talking about spending another $658 million by mid-1973.

Even this commitment, however, appears now to be only a part of the ultimate burden to be borne by the taxpayer, which has been footing 85 percent of the bill for the development of this commercial aircraft by Boeing and General Electric. It now appears that private financing for commercial production may well not be available, and thus the Federal Government—in other words, the taxpayer—will have to step in and foot the financing bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is a clear illustration of the observation that far too often our economy is a mixture of socialism for the rich and free enterprise for the poor.

In addition, the relaxation of performance requirements for the SST, which has occurred, will have the result of requiring costly major expansions of airport runways because of the longer takeoff and landing field requirements. This same downgrading of requirements means that the final SST will be much noisier than was originally contemplated, leading to the possibility that many airports will totally bar the aircraft. And because the takeoff and landing speeds will be greater than originally stipulated, the danger factor will increase, and the dissuading of passengers from flying on the SST will thereby increase.

In sum, the financial outlay is enormous. If Congress has not in the past had the wisdom to rectify this error, at least now it has another chance. I do not think we can, with any credibility whatsoever, claim to be attending to the needs of this Nation, and at the same time appropriate funds for this plane. Our only rational option is support of the Yates amendment, and it is an option we simply cannot spurn.

For it is hard to conceive of such an enormous expenditure of moneys in the absence of the most compelling justifications. And the striking fact about the SST appropriation is that, rather than being buttressed by compelling justifications, it is subject to the most trenchant and significant criticisms.

In addition to cost, there is the effect of the SST upon our environment. While the Federal Aviation Administration has proposed a regulation that would ban supersonic flight over the continental United States, in an effort to avoid sonic booms, the SST will still produce unprecedented airport noise. Dr. Richard L. Garwin, a physicist who headed a panel of President Nixon's Science Advisory Committee, has said that the takeoff of the SST will sound like "50 subsonic jets taking off simultaneously." As the chief sponsor of the most comprehensive legislation in either body of the Congress directed at abating and eliminating noise pollution—H.R. 15473, companion bills H.R. 16520 and H.R. 16708—I am particularly perturbed by this degradation of our environment which appears inevitable if the SST project proceeds at this time.

Noise is not the only contaminant to be produced by the SST. Engine discharges will add pollutants to the atmosphere. What is more, the Panel on Environmental and Sociological Impact—part of President Nixon's SST Ad Hoc Review Committee—reported that the widespread use of supersonic transports will introduce large quantities of water vapor into the stratosphere. The Panel suspects that the heavy water vapor thereby produced could affect the balance and circulation of atmospheric components, with the possibility of unpredictable climatic changes.

The SST is very clearly an environmental menace. Yet, the Department of Transportation has failed to comply with the Environmental Policy Act of 1969, which requires that all agencies include in every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment a detailed statement by the responsible official on the environmental considerations involved. Are not the dying Lake Erie, the fouled Hudson River, the smog overlay of Gary and Los Angeles ample lessons to us that progress is more than simply a matter of advanced technology.

National priorities compel termination of the SST program. The environmental hazards the SST poses do the same.

Other facets of this program lead to the same conclusion. For one thing, there is serious question about the safety of the SST. Greater takeoff and landing distances and speeds will be required than were originally anticipated. Thereby, the risk of a crash is increased. The purported benefit to our balance-of-trade ledger has been disputed by the report of the SST Ad Hoc Review Committee, submitted to the Secretary of Transportation and made public last October 31. The issue of prestige has been raised—unless the United States builds the SST, it will lose its leadership role in the aircraft field. It seems to me that whatever prestige might—and I stress "might"—accrue is totally incommensurate with the enormous expense and hazards which will assuredly follow from pursuing this program.

I urge that the amendment to strike the appropriation for the SST be approved.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

On several grounds it seems to me that appropriating more funds at this time for the SST prototype is extremely unwise. First, to do so does violence to my sense of priorities. Second, the economic advantages from the development of the SST are, at best, questionable. Third, the supersonic jet presents serious problems to populated areas, as well as an environmental hazard.

Mr. Chairman, today is a day we in the Congress can respond to the challenge to reorder our priorities. Enormous transportation problems face us as a Nation. We experience difficulties in getting our people in and out of cities, to go to and from work. We all know of countless examples where it takes longer to travel 50 to 70 miles than it does to fly several hundred miles.

A higher priority, in my opinion, should be given to safe, fast, clean commuter rail service for hundreds of thousands of American wage-earners than to an experimental airliner which will benefit only a few. Let us first spend our money on building a mass transportation system for our people.

We are proud of the free enterprise system. If the SST is really worthwhile, then it is incumbent upon aircraft companies and airlines to finance its construction. If not, then the taxpayer should not be called upon to do so.

There are serious questions concerning the utility of the SST. The sonic boom problem is well known. It will not permit the SST to operate over populated areas. A sonic boom arrives with a sudden, loud, unnerving bang, and a pressure is created, capable of shattering windows, cracking plaster, vibrating shelves, and triggering rock slides.

Our airports are presently overtaxed. Without additional airports, we will doubtless experience pressures to permit the SST to use present facilities neighboring metropolitan communities.

Serious questions are asked as to the

effect of this jet aircraft on the ecology of our planet. Fears of noise pollution, air pollution, and the possible effect on our climate are shared by scientists of known reputation, as well as Government officials.

Mr. Richard L. Garwin of the Watson Laboratories of the International Business Machines Corp., has said that the chief problem aside from the sonic boom is the "airport noise problem."

Mr. Garwin said:

> It will be like 50 subsonic jets taking off simultaneously. There is a risk whether localities will allow them to operate.

It is interesting to note that, as Mr. Garwin put it:

> The Federal Aviation has authority to set noise standards; it has not yet done so for the SST.

An SST Ad Hoc Review Committee reports that the SST, on landing or taking off, will produce 100 decibels over an area 4 miles by 2 miles surrounding the runway.

The exposure to intense noise will be intolerable to a very high percent of the exposed population and may result in permanent hearing loss, cardiovascular, glandular, respiratory, and neurologic changes and possibly chronic psychologic disturbances.

The Review Committee also found that the SST will release water vapor at a weight 40 percent greater than the weight of fuel consumed, and that the introduction of additional water vapor could alter the radiation balance, possibly affecting the general circulation of atmospheric components.

With regard to air pollution, the then Under Secretary of the Interior, Russell Train, cited atmospheric pollution and ground contamination as another environmental hazard.

Furthermore, the operation of the SST at subsonic speeds, including speeds necessary for takeoff and landing results in inefficient fuel combustion with a heavy discharge of air pollutants.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when funds are needed for pollution control, education, housing, job training, and rural revitalization, I urge we delay further prototype development.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to some of the arguments in opposition to the SST; and it strikes me that, in view of the economic benefit to be derived, the SST should have a high priority in our society.

Some of those who have opposed investment in the supersonic transport have done so on the theory that it will not have an economic benefit. It seems to me that some of those people will be the same ones who would come to this Congress to ask that the Federal Government be an employer of last resort should we have a sharp increase in unemployment in our society.

We now have increasing unemployment in the aircraft industry in this country, and further danger lies ahead, it seem to me, if we do not maintain our needed aircraft industry. In that event it seems to me wise to invest in the SST not only as a means of maintaining employment in that industry but also as a means of returning to the Federal Government the investment we have already made. It is anticipated that return will be double the investment that the taxpayers are being asked to put into this project, if one merely takes the direct benefit from royalties. If one takes the benefit from taxes, however, it is estimated that the return will be some 5½ times.

The economic advantages to be derived from the balance-of-payments benefits coming out of the eventual sale of American-made SST's around the world is estimated to be something in the nature of $11½ billion based upon the assumption of 500 planes being sold. But more than that, we would have the benefit which would be derived to this country's economy from additional trade. I do not mean trade with Europe, where we might reduce the flight time from 6 hours to 2 hours. I mean the trade to distant cities of the world, places half way around the world, such as India, to which we could make the trip, for economic and trade purposes, in less than a day. This transport will bring those places in the world closer to us, closer to American factories and markets, and increase the economic gain of the United States.

There are some problems, such as the question of sonic boom, noise, and air pollution, which yet have to be solved. But we have been advised in the hearings we have had in the Joint Economic Committee that these are disadvantages which will yield to scientific solution.

Finally, we can save the investment we have made thus far by continuing, in a steady and orderly phase on this investment by developing the SST through its next step.

I am concerned as a Representative in this Congress who comes from the area which gave the country flight—the area around Dayton, Ohio. I believe in making continued progress in flight. If some of my colleagues who are in opposition to the SST had been advising Isabella, we would be having this debate somewhere on the Mediterranean shores at this time. This is a rapidly changing world. We ought to be a part of that change in this country, and we can be part of it to our economic advantage. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to restate the arguments that have been so well stated by so many of my colleagues who have taken the floor to voice their objections to the SST. I am going to vote against the SST, and I just want to take this moment to salute the leader of that fight, the distinguished gentleman from Chicago (Mr. YATES), and I want to associate myself with every one of the statements he has made in opposition to the SST.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, since 1903 the United States has been a leader in the exciting field of aviation. We are the Nation that gave to the world such pioneers of the air as Orville and Wilbur Wright, Glenn Curtis, Richard E. Byrd, Glenn Martin, Donald Douglas, William Boeing, Charles Lindbergh, Wiley Post, and so many, many others. In recent years we have been the commercial leader in sale of transports to the free world. Indeed, we were responsible for providing over 80 percent of the free world's commercial fleet. Now we are asked to abandon the field and the economic advantages to the Russians, the British and the French. I think this would be utter madness.

Over the last few weeks I have heard much and I have read even more on why we should abandon Government-sponsored research on the supersonic transport. The opponents of the supersonic transport would have us believe that we are operating on a vacuum. This is ridiculous. The Russians and the Anglo-French consortium have already flown prototype versions at supersonic speeds. These prototypes have logged hundreds of hours in the air.

The world will have supersonic transports. The question is, Do we want to abandon the field to the Russians, French and British—to lose, by default, a market with a potential value in excess of $20 billion? I for one am not prepared to do so. And let me point out that just because we fail to develop our own supersonic transports is no indication that they will not be flown to and from the United States.

A number of American carriers have already placed orders for the Anglo-French Concorde. The only reason more have not done so is that they are waiting to see what we are going to do about having our own supersonic transport. Many foreign carriers are also waiting to see what we will do. We are simply planning a better aircraft.

Every comparative analysis I have seen on the three transports indicates that the Boeing transport would be superior to the Concorde or the Russian TU-144. The range, passenger capacity, cruising speed and overall efficiency of our transport would be greatly superior to that of our foreign competitors. This is the reason so many carriers are willing to wait. They want a superior product even if they must wait longer for it.

But if we abandon the race you can be sure that the orders for Concordes and TU-144's will rise significantly.

Despite claims to the contrary, I am convinced that an American supersonic transport will greatly improve our balance-of-payment position. The argument that this is not so is based on the specious reasoning that most of the passengers using the supersonic transport would be Americans, but so long as the Americans are free to travel abroad they will do so. The supersonic transport will not change that.

But if Americans must use dollars to buy foreign transports for competitive reasons, our balance of payment may

suffer by a net loss of about $16 billion. On the other hand, every American transport sold abroad would help our balance of payment. And by 1990 this figure could run as high as $10 billion.

But let us go back to the question that most international ticket purchasers would be Americans. With the dramatic increase in the standard of living of the average Japanese and Western European, why should we not encourage them to a much greater extent than we have in the past to visit our country. We have much to offer to tourists from abroad.

Most opponents of the supersonic transport do not appear to have given too much attention to the domestic economic impact of not developing our own transport. The airspace industry is ailing. Our failure to develop our own supersonic transport would add immensely to their problems. In fact, we are talking about 50,000 direct jobs and at least 100,000 jobs indirectly in production. Can we afford this particularly in view of our worsening unemployment situation? I think not.

Some feel that if the Nation wants a supersonic transport, private industry should bear the entire burden of developing it. The Federal Government they reason, should not have to subsidize it. But in fact the Federal Government does subsidize other forms of transportation. We have provided substantial assistance to our own highway program, to urban rapid transportation and to our merchant fleet. But what we put into the supersonic transport may well be completely recouped many times over through royalties and tax revenues.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the question is not so much whether we can afford to provide assistance to the development of our own supersonic transport, but rather whether we can afford, from an economic or a technological viewpoint, to abandon the field to the Russians, the British, and the French.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. A few minutes ago the gentleman from New York made mention of the fact that we might spend the money that we would put into the SST program in creating additional jobs in the Job Corps or other training programs.

I would like to inform the gentleman that companies which are involved in producing the SST already have extensive programs and, of course, to cut out this program at this time, which would particularly have the overall long-range effect of cutting back jobs in this country, I think would do far greater damage to the job opportunities than we could counteract by other programs—good programs though they might be—simply to train people additionally in this country. The training is useless without the jobs.

I think the continuation of the supersonic transport program is good for the Nation because it means that we will remain in competition with the Russians and with the British-French Concorde aircraft, both of which are already flying. They have problems, however, and I am certain that the American supersonic aircraft will be superior when it comes into the market.

If we abandon the SST at this time, we would be writing off a large part of the international aircraft market that has been a very important one to the United States in the past.

The supersonic transport program is important for U.S. balance of payments and jobs. The problems of pollution and noise have been exaggerated or misunderstood. However, I do feel that studies should continue and am convinced that the United States can and will build a better airplane and solve the problems that are involved.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered to the bill by my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

I listened to one of the speakers a few moments ago who suggested that we could not be considering this matter in a worse possible context than we are today. He suggested we are in the throes of an economic crisis. I just came from the Speaker's lobby where I noted a story on the ticker to the effect that the stock market was up 32 points at about 3 o'clock, and I think it would be very sad, indeed, if we were to formulate hasty and ill-considered legislation today while we were wrongly thinking our country was foundering and we did not have the resources necessary to construct this jet airplane.

Mr. Chairman, fact and fancy are flying furiously around the debate over the SST. It seems to me that the least we can do is to set the record straight on a few of the facts.

First, the Secretary of Transportation, Mr. Volpe, has assured us in writing that the administration is asking only for funds to build prototype aircraft, not production aircraft. This project is still in the nature of an experiment, and I think we owe it to our economy and to the country as a whole to wait until the initial results are in and we can evaluate the performance of the SST, the potential pitfalls in its production, and the possible effects it may have on the economy and the environment.

Second, Mr. Volpe has assured us that every effort is being made to minimize the adverse effects of the SST on the environment. The prototype models of the SST are not being produced in a vacuum. They are being produced in a climate of growing concern by all Americans over the deterioration of our environment, and a substantial portion of these prototype funds are going to be used to study ways of reducing possible adverse effects on our environment. A continuing review of those effects will, I am sure, be a consideration in future funding of this project.

Finally, I am impressed by the case made by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS) that this is not going to be a continuing Federal subsidy to an ailing industry. Mr. James Beggs, Under Secretary of Transportation, has said in a letter to the New York Times that if and when production is begun, the entire Government subsidy will be recovered from royalties on the first 300 aircraft produced, out of a projected demand for 420 to 800 aircraft. The Government is going to get its money back on this project. We are not calling on the taxpayers of this country to spend billions and billions of dollars that are never going to come back into the Treasury.

I wonder where some of my friends who support this amendment are going to be a couple of years from now if this amendment prevails, and if we then have the gold flow leaving this country, and if we have an adverse balance of payments because we have been shut out of the international export market, and if we have thousands and thousands of people unemployed in the great aerospace industry because of our lack of faith in the American economy. I wonder what they are going to be saying then.

I hope the House will have the good sense to reject the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) to delete funding for the SST. I opposed proceeding with this project last year, when only a third as much money was involved. Nothing has happened since then to persuade me that the benefits of this giant gadget will outweigh the burdens on the taxpayer and the hazards to the environment.

I want only to add that even if the SST were likelier than it is to fulfill the fondest dreams of its fans, I would object to going ahead at this time. Given the need for budgetary belt tightening, it seems unwise to embark on the first Federal program to subsidize the construction of commercial aircraft. With funding for basic scientific research, especially medical research, at a spartan level, I cannot reconcile an expenditure of almost $300 million for the SST with a sound scale of priorities.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the $290 million for funding of the supersonic transport in this appropriation bill.

We have just been informed that the administration's earlier forecast of a budget surplus for 1971 has now been turned into a frightening deficit, we have seen retail prices rise at an annual rate of 7.2 percent last month, and we have watched the stock market decline to a low of more than 250 points since the early months of this administration. It is simply incredible, with the economy teetering on the verge of recession and no effective executive action being taken to reverse the trend, that we are being asked today to give our assent to taxpayer financing of a development program whose costs should be borne by private business.

Mr. Speaker, the SST program is al-

ready 4 months behind schedule, and it comes as no surprise to learn that the cost overruns to the Government have now reached $76 million. Now the Department of Transportation puts out the word that Boeing may not be able to finance production of the plane, and we can see the opening wedge for a request to the Government to bail out the company and guarantee some or all of the $3 billion estimated production costs for a plane that will benefit very few people indeed.

It is immaterial that the proponents of Government financing of the SST testify that Federal funds will eventually be repaid to the Treasury. What is material is the alarming condition of the economy of this country and the loss of faith evidenced in the plummeting stock market. When the President sends to Congress a tightly controlled anti-inflationary budget that calls for only $200 million for cancer research in fiscal 1971 and $60 million for narcotics programs, it is ludicrous to propose this $290 million SST boondoggle. It should be defeated and put on the back burner where it belongs. Once again there is a regrettable confusion of priorities which we in the Congress need to set straight.

Mr. Chairman, it was formerly a question of whether the airlines or the taxpayers should pay the bills for development of the SST, but now we are confronted with some crucial decisions as to whether this plane ought to be allowed to ever get off the ground. In regard to the unacceptable sonic booms that will be caused by the SST, which we are told will prevent its being flown over land at supersonic speeds, we now learn that the noise level of the SST at subsonic speeds will be intolerable. Added to these considerations, the recent testimony of Russell Train, Chairman of the Environmental Quality Council, on the effects that supersonic flights will have on the atmosphere are shocking. I quote from the pertinent part of Mr. Train's statement, which I regard as alarming enough to justify an immediate moratorium on development of the SST:

I now turn to a potential problem which has not received the attention it deserves. The supersonic transport will fly at an altitude between 60,000 and 70,000 feet. It will place into this part of the atmosphere large quantities of water, carbon dioxide, nitrogen oxides and particulate matter. This part of the atmosphere is to a substantial extent isolated from the rest of the atmosphere. For example, on the average, 18 months are required for a water molecule introduced into the atmosphere at 65,000 feet to find its way to the lower atmosphere. A fleet of 500 American SST's and Concordes flying in this region of the atmosphere could, over a period of years, increase the water content by as much as 50 to 100 per cent. This could be very significant because observations indicate that the water vapor content of the stratosphere has already increased about 50 per cent over the last five years due presumably to natural processes, although there is a possibility which should be researched that subsonic jets have been contributing to this increase.

Water in this part of the atmosphere can have two effects of practical significance. First, it would affect the balance of heat in the entire atmosphere leading to a warmer average surface temperature. Calculations on the magnitude of this increased temperature are most uncertain but probably it would be on the order of .2 to .3° F. Secondly, water vapor would react so as to destroy some fraction of the ozone that is resident in this part of the atmosphere. The practical consequences of such a destruction could be that the shielding capacity of the atmosphere to penetrating and potentially highly dangerous ultraviolet radiation is decreased. As in the case of surface temperature, we do not have adequate knowledge on which to make secure judgments as to the practical significance of the effect of water on the ozone. Finally, the increased water content coupled with the natural increase could lead in a few years to a sun shielding cloud cover with serious consequences on climate.

Clearly the effects of supersonics on the atmosphere are of importance to the whole world. Any attempt to predict those effects is necessarily highly speculative at this time. The effects should be thoroughly understood before *any country* proceeds with a massive introduction of supersonic transports.

There are other potential adverse environmental consequences of supersonics for example, the effect of sonic booms over water on ship crews and passengers and on nesting birds on isolated islands. However, I will not discuss these as I have tried to confine my remarks to what I consider the two most important issues—namely noise in and around airports and atmospheric effects.

It is clear from this statement, Mr. Chairman, that the present state of our science indicates our inability to control the potential hazards to us all if the supersonic transport is allowed to fly. These uncertainties must be dealt with before we invest another dollar of the taxpayers' money. The economic and environmental factors clearly call for a resounding "Nay" vote on the SST.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote to delete the appropriations for the supersonic transport from this appropriation bill. I do so solely upon the basis of allocating Federal resources at this time. I believe we will fly supersonically someday—and I hope we do soon. I believe we will fly faster than supersonically. We cannot stop man in his quest for speed and progress.

I believe all of the pollutant and ecological threats can be corrected by our technology and our dedication to eliminating offenses to sight and sound. The exaggerated criticisms and unsubstantiated complaints do not impress me.

I believe the concept is sound, technically feasible, and that laws can and should control any assaults upon our environment or ecology.

In fact, I believe the concept is good enough that it can attract adequate private investment at this time.

But most importantly now, the Nation and our economy cannot afford deficit spending. We must reduce Federal spending. We must devote Federal resources to programs more within the Federal responsibility. This does not mean that deletion of this relatively small item will permit Federal solution of all the other programs mentioned by the proponents of this amendment to delete funds for the SST. Other cuts in Federal spending must be made this year in other popular and necessary programs. With these dismal prospects we must seriously reconsider our priorities. I am willing to start with the SST.

One more point, Mr. Chairman, the point made just previously by the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER) regarding the minority's parliamentary right of a motion to recommit. The majority has overwhelming power by way of numbers, committee chairmanships, and the leadership resources. It should not be permitted to usurp the prerogative of the minority as provided under the rule and the custom and precedents of this House.

It appears that the debate has been adequate and that the vote in the committee will be determinative. I believe it is unfair and misleading to construe any vote on a motion on the previous question as a vote on the merits of any substantive issue.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL) has indicated that his motion to recommit will include some instruction to delete, at least in part, appropriations for the SST.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise only to inform the committee that I oppose the amendment offered by my distinguished and lovable friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. YATES and Mr. BOLAND.

The committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 86, noes 102.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESERVE TRAINING

For all necessary expenses for the Coast Guard Reserve, as authorized by law, including repayment to other Coast Guard appropriations for indirect expenses, for regular personnel, or reserve personnel while on active duty, engaged primarily in administration and operation of the reserve program; maintenance and operation of facilities; and supplies, equipment, and services; $17,500,000: *Provided*, That amounts equal to the obligated balances against the appropriations for "Reserve training" for the two preceding years shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation, and such merged appropriation shall be available as one fund, except for accounting purposes of the Coast Guard, for the payment of obligations properly incurred against such prior year appropriations and against this appropriation: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be available for a Selected Reserve programed to be in excess of 10,000 personnel on October 31, 1970.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEED

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEED: On page 5, line 21, strike out "$17,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,900,000".

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, at the outset let me say that in the matter of the Coast Guard I have no personal or district interest since there is no Coast Guard installation of any sort whatsoever in the area that I represent. I might

say that the distance my district is situated from the coast is such that the safety of the ports of this Nation is not a major item to my district. My interest in supporting this amendment stems from the fact that several years ago when the first steps were taken to upgrade and modernize the Coast Guard I happened to be a member and later chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that had charge of the Coast Guard at that time and I participated in the funding of a number of things designed to bring the Coast Guard into a more modern posture. Included in this program was the Reserve training. I think the reasons given then are still valid now as to why we need these Coast Guard Reserves and the kind of a training program that will enable the Coast Guard in times of national emergency to meet the very unusual and peculiar mission that we have outlined for it. The Select Reserve, which is involved here, is, in my opinion, probably the cheapest and best insurance that this country has for port security in times of national emergency. The need will be one that cannot be met if we do not have some device of this kind to meet it should the need arise. We have a great need for the Coast Guard today, and that need is growing and expanding. You are all familiar with the problems of pollution, oil slicks, and that sort of thing that have developed. We know oceanography and the development of the resources of the seas will become more and more a part of the future. So the need for the Coast Guard to accomplish its missions will increase and not decrease. We spend enormous sums of money for all sorts of national defense facilities to make our country secure. Yet one of the most vulnerable spots we have in a time of national emergency will be the very ports that serve our country.

There has been criticism, Mr. Chairman, that the Coast Guard Select Reserve has not had an adequate training program. Perhaps that is true, but to me the answer is not to wipe it out, as has been proposed in the budget, but to improve it so that this organization can and will be able to meet its mission as the need arises.

In the budget proposal the entire reserve program was wiped out. The subcommittee of which I am a member saw fit to restore 10,000 of the 15,000 Select Reservists. I call your attention to the fact that earlier this year this House and this Congress passed legislation which authorized the Select Reserve to have 16,500 men. All my amendment does is restore the amount of money we are spending in the Reserve program right now. It does not add any money but keeps the program at its present level.

I know that arguments will be made that some of the leaders of the Coast Guard themselves did not make a strong case for this. They were under a mandate not to. I talked to a great many Coast Guard authorities privately, and I know that they still feel this program is vitally needed and that it can be and will be improved. I think it is just pennywise and pound foolish for us to begin at this time to do what the bill as it now stands will do to the Coast Guard Reserve. I feel very strongly about this or I would not be here offering an amendment in opposition to the gentlemen I serve with on this subcommittee. I know it is a very difficult thing to go over the budget and ask for increases, but I think if the proper attention had been given to this by the budgetmakers, this item would already have been in the budget and we would not be here today in this posture.

So, Mr. Chairman, again I want to emphasize what we are trying to do here is to keep the program at the level it now is and give the Coast Guard a chance to improve its training and get this organization in shape, capable of filling the needs, what might be legitimate needs, of meeting life-and-death demands in times of national emergency if our country is ever attacked.

We all know that the Coast Guard will become an active part of the Navy in times of national emergency and we are going to need the resources that the Reserve gives them if they can continue.

Mr. Chairman, it is very likely that as the years go by a lot more peacetime use of the Coast Guard Reserve will be needed. We have had many natural disasters in which the resources of the Coast Guard have been strained to meet the needs of the country.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think this is a program that gives a very good return on our dollar. It does not make sense to me that we will cut one-third of the Coast Guard Reserve at a time when we ought to be increasing it and improving it.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members will have the same faith in the program now that they had earlier this year when we passed the authorizing legislation.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in wholehearted support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

I was quite shocked to learn that the Bureau of the Budget had decided to discontinue the Coast Guard Selected Reserve training program by the end of 1971.

According to the Bureau, this action would produce a savings of $25 million in 1972. Perhaps it would. If we discontinue the Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force, it would also produce a savings; but I doubt that this would be considered a wise move.

First of all, I have serious doubt that the President has this authority. According to my interpretation, the Reserve Bill of Rights and Vitalization Act of 1967 places this responsibility squarely on the Congress. The act states that the strength of the Selected Reserve of each of the Reserve components, including the Coast Guard, will be set by the Congress annually. It is unbelievable that the Bureau of the Budget would attempt to preempt the authority of the Congress and unlawfully regulate the strength of the Selected Reserve.

But even if we assume that Budget had this authority, this would still be an unprecedented and unwanted proposal.

To completely eliminate an essential element of our defense team not only undermines the Nation's total military strength, but it is also a serious challenge to the concept of citizenship involvement and duty regarding national defense. In addition such action would have a brutal effect upon the morale of all reservists in our Armed Forces. If the Coast Guard Reserve is eliminated, what will be the next Reserve unit to follow.

The Coast Guard Reserve stands ready to perform vital functions in emergency situations. The security of our ports is a case in point. Their protection must be complete and effective. The Selected Reserve can back up the captains of the ports throughout the country. This component can be mobilized and on the job within a matter of hours in the major ports. The Selected Reserve has kept abreast of the constant changes that take place in port areas by periodic training at individual ports. Neither the Retired Reserves nor the Standby Reserves would have the organization to accomplish this in a brief period of time. The point I am trying to make is that the Ready Reserve has effectively trained the teams ready to be mobilized, teams familiar with specific areas, able to move in and become operational in the shortest period of time. It is inconceivable to me how the Coast Guard can possibly be prepared for national emergencies by depending on retired personnel and those serving their 2-year obligation after initial enlistment. This is specious argument, for they cannot be recalled to meet contingency. Further, even if it were possible to recall them, you would have an elderly force made up of all chiefs and no Indians.

We have heard much in recent days about our hopes to someday have a volunteer military force rather than depend on our present draft system. The Secretary of Defense has repeatedly said the success of such a volunteer force depends directly upon an increase of all Reserve forces and not their elimination. The Coast Guard certainly did not know that this action would be taken nor did they want it. During hearings before the House Committee on Armed Services, the commandant of the Coast Guard stated that the Coast Guard had recommended a Selected Reserve in the amount of 16,590. In answer to questions he stated that his opinion was not sought by anyone on the availability to meet the wartime mission of the Selected Reserve; that he first learned of the decision to phase out the Reserve when it was presented to him "as a decision"; that the number of 16,590 was a minimal need to fulfill the mission assigned without impairment to the national security.

If you look carefully, the Bureau of the Budget not only proposes to eliminate the Selected Reserve but it has other far-reaching effects. It covers up the fact that it is destroying the entire Coast Guard Reserve program which has laboriously developed and maintained a trained mobilization force with suitable training facilities and equipment over a period of 20 years. This investment of over $250 million would be almost totally lost. For these and many other reasons,

I urge that you not eliminate this necessary Reserve.

The House Appropriations Committee has recommended $17.5 million which provides only a Selected Reserve strength of 10,000. In view of the strong recommendation of the Armed Services Committee, the affirmative action of the House on May 6 authorizing a Coast Guard Selected Reserve strength of 16,590 and Admiral Trimble's testimony concerning the Reserve, I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment to reinstate the $12 million necessary to keep this Selected Reserve at its proper strength.

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

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the "College of Cardinals" in the Committee on Appropriations—that is the name given to the subcommittee chairmen—I now fly in the face of the gods in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma, who was also a chairman at one time.

Several years ago, Mr. Chairman, you will recall the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES), and myself, and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT), who now sits in front of me, came on this floor, and we manned the barricades in behalf of the Reserves, all of the Reserve components—Army, Navy, Air, and the Coast Guard—even though the Coast Guard by law is under the Treasury Department. I could never figure that out. The historic reason, I know, but I cannot figure it out today. I still think it should be under the Department of Defense. But anyhow I speak, Mr. Chairman, in support of the philosophy, the intent, and the purpose of Organized Reserves, including the Select Reserve of the Coast Guard.

It has been suggested that they have not been called, nobody called them. What do you want them for? Well, what in the world do you want with an insurance policy? You pay high premiums on an insurance policy that in case you need it, in case there is a fire, you have protection and insurance. That is the reason for the existence of any Reserve component.

The suggestion was made, "We are not against the Reserves, we have given them x numbers of dollars." I am aware of that. But that argument I have resisted on this floor since World War II. I know of a dozen efforts to destroy the Reserves, by executive fiat, by departmental action, and now by some glorified clerk in the Bureau of the Budget.

Well, now there is authority for you—there is authority for you. For national defense, for protection of the coasts.

So, Mr. Chairman, this does not need 5 minutes, this just needs what I have said, even if no one else says anything.

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

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the statement just made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) has brought forcibly before the Committee that we are not passing upon the merits of a judgment as to defense needs, but whether or not it is appropriate for budgetary action to remove protection.

Protection that is on a standby basis is protection that we hope we will not need. But if the eventuality of all-out war occurred, we will have no time then to train and organize in order to protect our ports.

This mission has been assigned to the Coast Guard. As it has been pointed out, during the time of peace, the Coast Guard Reserve is under the Department of Transportation. It is not under the Department of Defense.

But immediately upon the creation of this need, it must function as one of the most important security elements in our defense system.

It is very clear that the budgetary action which was taken was without the consideration of the mission because when the committee asked the Navy how it was to be handled, the response was very clear, that the present system was the best that could be provided and that there was no alternative.

The distinguished Committee on Appropriations has partially remedied this error, but it has not done so completely.

I would like to point out that the figure which is presently in the bill would only permit a partial job. Does that mean that we should have some ports not protected at all? Should we have ports inadequately secure? Should we omit some of the various other assignments that go to the Selected Reserve in augmenting the fleet in time of crisis?

I think none of these alternatives would prove acceptable.

Therefore, I trust that we will respond with a favorable vote on this amendment so that we can at least continue the very important service of these fine trained units which can go into action immediately as required.

Several weeks ago when we were considering H.R. 17123, I outlined to the House the position of the Armed Services Committee on the Selected Reserve of the Coast Guard and, therefore, I will not repeat that discussion. I would like to stress that after extensive hearings on the mission requirements for the wartime role of the Selected Reserve of the Coast Guard, as assigned by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the House Armed Services Committee found it required an absolute minimum strength of 16,590. This manning was recommended and the House authorized it without one voice being raised in objection.

Today we are considering the Department of Transportation appropriation bill. It proposes to reduce to 10,000 the number of men in the Selected Reserve of the Coast Guard. In so doing, the committee properly differed with the budgetary move to phase out the Coast Guard during fiscal year 1971. This is because the members of the Appropriations Committee recognized that there is no other available manpower trained to perform the work assigned to the Coast Guard Reserve, particularly, the one important wartime mission; namely, that of port security. Now, the testimony is clear that approximately 70 percent of the total strength of the Selected Reserve of the Coast Guard would be devoted to performing port security. In other words, to perform that wartime mission in this vital security area would require slightly over 11,500 persons. How then can the committee justify a reduction of strength to 10,000?

You would have a shortage of over 1,500 individuals. We should ask ourselves which ports are to be left unguarded? Or, if they all are to be protected, will the coverage be adequate to perform the assigned task? This deficiency in the number of personnel assigned to cover the vital area of port security, while in itself is cause for serious concern, is further magnified by the fact that there will be still further dilution of strength if the other military missions assigned to Coast Guard Reserve are to be undertaken.

These other wartime missions assigned to the Coast Guard Reserve are:

First, wartime augmentation of existing vessels, and manning of additional Coast Guard and Navy vessels for duties as assigned, including ocean station operations.

Second, expansion of search and rescue operations to support military requirements.

Third, expansion of aids to navigation and icebreaking in support of wartime military requirements.

Fourth, augmentation of merchant marine safety activities in support of a greatly expanded wartime merchant marine fleet.

The early response personnel required to fulfill these miscellaneous wartime missions amount to 30 percent of the Coast Guard's Selected Reserve or approximately 5,000 officers and enlisted men which are not available for early response from non-Selected Reserve sources.

Would anyone argue that these missions in time of war are not essential? The Joint Chiefs of Staff who made the assignment felt that they were. These missions have been reviewed on two recent occasions and were found to be completely valid.

Either we must omit these additional missions or further dilute the mission of port security if we allow the 10,000 figure to stand. In my opinion, either alternative presents unnecessary security risks.

We are not talking about a big amount of money here. The entire cost to restore the Coast Guard to the strength figure authorized for them would be approximately $12,000,000. Gentlemen, it seems incredible that we would let this sum create a catastrophic risk in our national security.

I urge your support of the amendment.

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

Mr. PIRNIE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DOWNING) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) and others who have taken up the cudgels here for the Coast Guard.

I am on the Coast Guard Subcommit-

tee of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Many of us were deeply concerned when we saw the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget to cut this back. We are very pleased to see that we are using this vehicle today, and this a very good amendment, to restore the desired quota of the Coast Guard Select Reserve.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. PIRNIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my support of this amendment and to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman in the well.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. PIRNIE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman. I feel this is a good amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have introduced legislation to protect the Coast Guard from the budgetary attack being made upon its reserves. The Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, has voted to maintain the Coast Guard Reserve. The funding sought by the amendment now before us is needed to give substance to the recommendation made by our committee. I sincerely hope that the House will approve this amendment which is in the interest of the national defense of our country and of aid to our maritime position.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been impressed by the strength of the arguments advanced for the Steed amendment which I support. I believe the Coast Guard Reserve should be fully funded and continued in full operation. The Coast Guard and its Reserve are essential elements of our defense team and as every Member of the House realizes both are highly important in peace and in war.

Attention has been called to the fact that the Armed Services Committee has explored this matter and that important committee supports the continuation of a full-fledged Coast Guard Reserve. This, in itself, is very significant.

I note also that the officials of the Coast Guard, and these are the men who are responsible for its successful operation, strongly endorse a continuation of a full-scale Reserve program. The Steed amendment would accomplish this. Other witnesses of high rank have given testimony which indicates that the decision to eliminate or to drastically cut back the Coast Guard Reserve was not carefully thought through. For instance, the Assistant Chief of Naval Operations has testified that the Navy is not able to take on additional missions of the Coast Guard which might be anticipated from the reduction of the Coast Guard Reserve. I believe there is ample evidence that the proposed action is justifiable and that the Steed amendment should be approved.

Remember, we are talking not only about the Coast Guard's place in national defense, but we are talking about the security of our merchant vessels, our ports, and our harbors. The shipping industry is essential to defense transportation, but it is equally essential to the peacetime economy of the Nation.

Undoubtedly considerations of economy have entered very strongly into the decision to eliminate the Coast Guard Selected Reserve. But the fact is it was done without consideration for the recommendations of the Office of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Coast Guard. I strongly suggest that the action was unwarranted. The Coast Guard has its area of responsibility and fills it in a most commendable way. There are no provisions by which these areas of responsibility can be assumed by another service. The Coast Guard must have its reserve forces if it is to realistically perform the important work with which it is entrusted. Consequently, I believe that the Congress should support the Coast Guard Reserve program and provide the necessary funds for the retention and training of its forces to the highest degree of readiness.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I do so reluctantly because it was while I was on the Post Office and Treasury Committee where I served with the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Vaughan Gary, that we urged the purchase of Yorktown as an installation. We worked hard to get Yorktown as a Reserve center.

Also, while it is very difficult to say what transpired in executive session, there were some of us in there, along with the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL) that felt we could go along with 10,000 reservists. As you recall the administration had asked for none. We thought we had done a yeoman service for the Coast Guard, a yeoman service for the country. We thought that port security would be well taken care of by having 10,000 reservists. Unfortunately, something has happened on the way to the forum, and now there are those who come here today and say that we should have 15,000 rather than 10,000.

We have heard a great deal of debate here today about the economic condition of this country, the unbalanced budget we have, our tight money policy, and many other things. We tried to save a pittance in this bill of about $8.15 million, and having done so, we find that everybody jumps down our backs.

This program started in 1950. It grew from $1 million to $27 million. That is a lot of money.

Nobody is going to tell me about the Coast Guard. I think it is one of the greatest services in the country. Of all the services put together, it is the best. I worked on the budget for the Coast Guard for 12 years. I moved as senior member of the Post Office and Treasury Committee mainly to get back to handle the Coast Guard budget. I think that 10,000 reservists will take care of the port security problems.

I feel badly that we are put in this embarrassing position. Let me read from the record. When the administration came up here and asked for no Standby Reserves, I became very upset. When Admiral Smith came up to the committee

I asked him many questions. I asked him how he was going to get by in time of emergency. Remember this: Many Members are confused about the Coast Guard Standby Reserve. They have never been called up. They were not called up during the Korean conflict; they have not been called up in Vietnam right now.

I said, "What is going to happen in time of emergency?"

As you know, in time of emergency, when there is a declared war, the Coast Guard becomes part of the Navy. I said, "What are you going to do with none of these Standby Reservists?"

Admiral Smith said this:

> Personnel will be reassigned from those peacetime missions, such as recreational boating safety, which would be curtailed in the event of a wartime emergency. Early graduation of Academy first class men, recruits, and basic petty officer trainees, would also be accomplished to provide a rapid increase of available manpower. In addition to these resources, action would be instituted to call up Reserves—Ready and Standby—and physically qualified retired personnel. The output of recruit centers would be increased by accepting more volunteers and by using selective service inductees if necessary. The recruiting of veteran volunteers from civilian areas would also add to the available manpower.

For those Members who would like to read further, this is from Part 1, page 210 and page 211, where I had a colloquy with the Commandant, Admiral Smith, who felt they could get by without any. So what do we do? We arrived at what I thought was a good compromise. We added 10,000 instead of none, and now we are faced with an amendment on the floor of this House to bring it up to full strength.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the full 5 minutes, but I think the remarks of the gentleman who just preceded me deserve some further comment. The gentleman suggested that he quoted at length from testimony of Admiral Smith, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and he referred Members to the hearings at x pages, and, of course, we all know the Members will not have the time now to read that at this moment, but I suggest the Members read the entire hearings of the testimony before the Committee on Armed Services and particularly the committee which is in charge of the Coast Guard, and there they will find that Admiral Smith testified—and I paraphrase it—that if he was not testifying under the restraints imposed upon him as Commandant of the Coast Guard and supporting the budget, he would be asking for 16,000 Reserves. There is absolutely nowhere in the testimony which is open and frank before the committee to indicate he was satisfied with no Reserve force at all.

Furthermore, it is interesting, I think, for those who wish to know and for the House to realize that this extinction of the Coast Guard was a decision made without the consultation of the Com-

mandant of the Coast Guard. He knew absolutely nothing about it until the decision had been reached, and he was told about it.

I also suggest the Members look to the law on the Revitalization Act, the Bill of Rights Act, and there they will note that the authority to place the floor of the Reserve forces is vested in the Armed Services Committee, or in the House of Representatives which through its Armed Services Committee discharges that responsibility.

It has heard the testimony from all the forces, and the testimony is emphatically there for any who care to read it, that 16,000 is a minimum.

The suggestion that something good was done by throwing in 10,000 is misleading. Ten thousand were not added. Sixteen thousand were taken away, or else I do not know my arithmetic.

So I suggest to the members of the committee that this amendment be supported. The gentlemen who have spoken, I ask Members to note, have been many of them from the Appropriations Committee itself, and they have risen in support of this amendment. I suggest we go about our business and give the Coast Guard what the Coast Guard wants, and give the Commandant what he wants, and what the Reserve wants, and what they have justified.

Allow me in conclusion to summarize what I have pointed out this far.

The Commandant of the Coast Guard, Admiral Smith, in testifying before the House Armed Services Committee said:

> We have a number of missions under the mobilization concept. These are assigned to us by the Navy, since we become a part of the Navy in time of war. Generally, these are in support of Navy responsibilities in wartime situations. The largest task in respect to resources is port security and port safety, which accounts for 70 percent of our early response reserve forces. In addition to that, we have tasks to participate in which are generally extensions of our peacetime missions in a wartime environment such as merchant marine safety, aids to navigation, vessel patroling, and antisubmarine operations.

A 2-year force analysis study completed by the Coast Guard determined that a Selected Reserve of 16,590 is required to carry out the Coast Guard's wartime missions. The Commandant of the Coast Guard has testified to this requirements and the Committee on Armed Services, after extensive hearings and careful study of the classified force analysis prepared by the Coast Guard, has strongly recommended it. This Selected Reserve strength of 16,590 was authorized by the House in H.R. 17123 passed on May 6.

The bill reported out by the Committee on Appropriations not only contains insufficient funds to support the Selected Reserve determined to be necessary in the force analysis study, it goes further and proposes the nullification of the previous House action authorizing a strength of 16,590 by providing that the appropriation shall not be used to support a Selected Reserve in excess of 10,000.

On the basis of extensive testimony and the facts contained in the report of the Armed Services Committee, there is no logic to either the arbitrary strength limitation or the insufficient funds proposed for the Coast Guard Reserve in the pending bill. Both the proposed limitation of 10,000 on strength and the proposed appropriation of $17.5 million would be insufficient to enable the Coast Guard to maintain a Selected Reserve large enough to perform even its port security mission in the crucial early days of mobilization. But the Commandant has testified that the port security mission represents only 70 percent of the Coast Guard's wartime mission requirements.

The pending bill completely ignores the requirement established by the force analysis study and by the Armed Services Committee for personnel to perform other wartime missions of the Coast Guard.

The Commandant has testified, and the force analysis study confirms, that the other wartime missions which must be met from the Selected Reserve include antisubmarine operations, vessel patroling and similar urgent tasks. An expansion of search and rescue operations to support military requirements is also necessary.

The Coast Guard's "force analysis" study, is one in which the Commandant states:

> A reduced FY 70 input would have caused unacceptably low Selected Reserve strengths in future years. . . . The low Selected Reserve strength is unacceptable because of the high risk involved.

We believe that a Selected Reserve strength of 16,590 is the absolute minimum for the performance of the Coast Guard's wartime missions. This has been repeated over and over again in testimony by the Commandant and other Coast Guard officials.

Furthermore, the Assistant Commandant, Vice Admiral Trimble, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee on May 5, that the Coast Guard would require $29.8 million to support the strength of 16,590 authorized by the House, and that this was, in fact, the amount which had been requested by the Coast Guard.

All of the facts point to the requirement for a Coast Guard Selected Reserve strength of 16,590 and the need for $29.8 million to support it. I urge you to support the amendment which would provide for these requirements, instead of the proposals in the bill which would not even meet the requirement for the port security mission and would ignore requirements for all of the other wartime missions.

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

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, knowing the services performed by the Coast Guard of this country in time of war and the services which it renders in peace, I wish very strongly to associate myself with the remarks of the able gentleman from Louisiana and others who have spoken in support of the amendment offered by the able gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED.)

Mr. HÉBERT. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I heard my friend and colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Florida, indicate that he was impressed by the strength of the arguments, but I am more impressed by the size and caliber of those supporting the amendment.

I believe the members of the Committee of the Whole ought to keep in mind that what the subcommittee did was to say to the Bureau of the Budget and to the administration, "You are not going to phase out the Selected Reserve."

When this budget came to our subcommittee, the Selected Reserve was being totally phased out by the end of fiscal year 1971. The committee sat down, argued, looked it over, and said, "We think there is a place for them."

As the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana says, there is a place for the Coast Guard in the national security of this Nation. There is no question about the fact that in time of war they do offer the best security for our ports, better than that of any of the other armed services. There is only one service, really, which offers that type of security.

The members ought to know that the training in the Selected Reserve program leaves a lot to be desired. I suppose one can say this about all the Reserve organizations. The fact of the matter is, we have found this to be true about the Coast Guard Selected Reserves training program.

A little more than a year ago we had an Appropriations Committee staff study made, not by members of our own committee but by men from the various departments, to investigate the worth of the Coast Guard Selected Reserve training program. The report is lying on the desk of my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE). I must say that the report indicated the training program was seriously deficient in most areas.

The request from the Coast Guard to the Bureau of the Budget for the Selected Reserve for the fiscal year 1971 was around $29 million. The Bureau of the Budget cut them back to $10 million.

This item increases every year. If one stays in the Coast Guard long enough, he earns retirement benefits, which after he retires we have to fund. The result is that this item will continue to increase. If we fund it at the level required by the amendment, we see we will have to spend in excess of a quarter of a billion dollars over the next 10 years.

Who recommended this phaseout of the Selected Reserve—certainly it was not recommended by any clerk in the lower echelons of the Department or the Bureau of the Budget. This was the recommendation of the Department of Transportation, of the Bureau of the Budget, and I assume of the President. It has also been agreed to by the Secretary of Defense.

All I ask of the members of this committee is to look at the action of our committee in a fair light. We have said to them, "You are not going to phase out the Coast Guard Selected Reserve, be-

cause we believe there may be good potential here."

But we are not going to get a good Coast Guard Selected Reserve program unless we keep their feet to the fire. How do we do that? By cutting out funds thereby reducing the excessive number of personnel in the Reserve.

My friend the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT) says the reserve strength indicated in the research and development and reserve strength bill which we passed a couple of weeks ago would call for a reserve strength in the Coast Guard of 16,590. The Bureau of the Budget recommends none after 1971. We say they can keep it at 10,000. This will be sufficient for the most important mission of the Coast Guard, that is, port security.

The fact of the matter is that 10,000 is the figure the Coast Guard indicated would be sufficient to take care of the operational port security requirements, if there is a national emergency.

The committee sincerely believes that this is a program which should be continued, but at a reduced level. I am sure that at a 10,000-man level the training in the program will be significantly improved.

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

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

Mr. McFALL. I just want the Members to know I join the chairman of my committee in opposing the amendment. I believe we have presented a reasonable program to the House, and we have explained to the House the reasonable basis on which we acted.

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

If we would just hesitate for a moment and look at what has happened in the past few minutes, we would see we sort of tread on what is a little bit ridiculous. We just passed through the aisle to vote upon a measure which would spend $289 million on something which is only an experiment. Now, for the sake of being conservative or trying to save some money we are listening to an argument that is going to eliminate a paltry $7.5 million, not for an experiment but for something that would be chopping down a reserve force which is one of the finest forces we have in the country.

Now, some people have said maybe there is something to be desired in this program. I do not know where they get their information, because the largest training base happens to be in my district, in Cape May, N.J., and I rate it second to none I have seen anywhere. I would like this House to know that of the people who serve there a good many of them are reservists. One of the largest classes of the Coast Guard ships that we have is the *Unimac* class. I would like the House to know that the skipper of the *Unimac* itself, which is the vessel that the class itself is named after, a four-stripe captain, happens to be a reservist and half of that crew are also reservists.

If we talk about spreading 10,000 men among the ports, let us not talk about sending them anywhere to the Middle West or anywhere like that, because it is just ridiculous. There happen to be thousands of ports on the Atlantic seaboard alone. The tiny State of New Jersey, for example, happens to have more than 200 miles of coastline, and it is just loaded with ports of all kinds. During the Second World War every inch of it had to be protected. You could use 10,000 men just on that kind of a coastline in an emergency if you had to.

I think we have come to a point which is almost ridiculous if we are talking about saving a paltry $7.5 million with any idea in mind that you are going to phase this program out. Happily the committee did put back some part of the reserve program, but I believe it is one that should be expanded as time goes on. If there is something wrong with the training program, let us improve the training program. The history of the Coast Guard itself is great and the history of this reserve can be just as great if not greater as time goes on.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of the amendment.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is with some reluctance that I rise in opposition to this amendment, but I would like to point out to my friends on the committee that the House Committee on Appropriations had prepared a staff report on the Coast Guard Reserve. I have it right here. It is 96 pages of the most condemning testimony I have ever read in any kind of a staff report. It points out that since 1951 up to and through 1969 we have spent over a quarter of a billion dollars on the Coast Guard Reserve. Yet in terms of actual performance the report says, and I will quote from it, "In its entire history it has never been mobilized. None of the national emergencies which have occurred between 1951 and 1969 caused an involuntary callup of these reservists."

Mr. Chairman, I could go on and on, but this report is one of the most critical and condemning reports I have ever read. I did not agree in appropriation committee to the 10,000 Coast Guard reservists. To add this additional 7,000 would be a mockery. The facts and record of the Coast Guard Reserve, yes with some exception, is not a good one—it is not in tune with the outstanding and excellent performance of the Regular Coast Guard.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEED

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEED: On page 6, line 4, change colon to a period and strike out all of line 4 beginning with "provided further" and through and including lines 5, 6 and 7.

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

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. For my part, Mr. Chairman, I will accept the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The bill reads in part as follows:

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; $3,200,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KOCH

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KOCH: On page 15 after line 6 insert:

"URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION FUND

"For an additional amount for grants and loans as authorized by the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended (49 USC 1601 et seq.) to remain available until expended, $82,000,000."

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I want to call something to your attention that I think has been overlooked.

We have a bill before us which is entitled an appropriation bill for the Department of Transportation, and I must tell you that there is not a single dollar of new funds for the mass transit fund in this bill, not one single dollar.

I want to tell you how that comes about and I want to urge upon the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) and others here to support the amendment I am offering.

The amendment would restore the money requested by the President for his new transportation program. These funds were cut from the budget by the Appropriations Committee because the President's program has not yet been approved by the Congress. But, I would remind our colleagues that we have an authorization for $300 million for fiscal year 1971 and so far only $214 million has been appropriated. Therefore, the additional $82 million could be added on the basis of an existing authorization, and I would urge that we do so in view of the urgent need our cities have for mass transit funds.

Is it unreasonable that we spend $300 million on mass transit in this day and age, when everybody—and I believe that the distinguished chairman from Massachusetts will agree—is concerned that there are not adequate mass transit facilities available in any of the cities of this country.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I should like to expand upon my statement, reciting in more detail how today's transportation appropriations bill clearly in-

dicates that mass transit is still very much a stepchild in our country's transportation program.

While hundreds of our urban centers are now faced with a transportation crisis—while every city has rush hour traffic congestion—and while auto pollution is taking a great toll on the health of our country's people, today we are considering an appropriation bill that contains no money at all for the urban mass transportation fund. Consequently, the Urban Mass Transportation Administration will have available only $214 million. This is an outrageous state of affairs.

This means, Mr. Chairman, that during the next fiscal year, we will be spending $290 million on the development of the SST while committing only $214 million to mass transit. It is both irrational and irresponsible for a society such as ours to spend more money on the development of a new aircraft, whose merits and success are in such question, so that the jet set can fly across the Atlantic in a couple of hours, while we ignore the very basic transportation that millions of working Americans use each day to get to work and back home again. In the concern over cutting flying time down by 4 hours to Europe, we are plainly neglecting the thousands of hours lost each week by people who are daily caught in traffic congestion, whether it be on the road, in a commuter railroad, or a subway. I am sure that if someone were to calculate the time that will be saved in a transoceanic flight in the SST—if indeed it ever gets off the ground—as compared to the man-hours that will continue to be lost in boggling transit facilities and snarled highways, the absurdity of this bill's priorities would be crystal clear.

Billions of dollars are needed to update the country's public transportation operations, and yet the administration and the Congress continue to commit to mass transit just 5 percent of what we put into highways. While $214 million will be available for mass transit, this bill approves an expenditure of $4.35 billion on highway construction.

In addition to inadequate funds, the mass transit program is being set back further by the Appropriations Committee's action in limiting the amount of funds the Department of Transportation will be able to obligate during fiscal year 1971.

The House Banking and Currency Committee now has before it a new contract authority program for mass transit submitted by the President and passed by the Senate. As approved by the committee's Housing Subcommittee this bill would provide $5 billion in contract authority in the next 5 years with $3 billion of this being liquidated by appropriations during the same period. With this new financing mechanism of contract authority, the Department of Transportation would be able to enter into long-term contractual obligations, so essential for mass transit planning and construction.

Today, however, this body is going to approve a bill which in effect wipes away contract authority. The Appropriations Committee has limited expenditures to $214 million, the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1971 last year. In the hearings UMTA indicated that it would obligate approximately $850 million, under the new contract authority mechanism, during fiscal year 1971. The $850 million is a mere pittance in the scale of our transportation demands—but today's legislation will make even this level of commitment impossible. A dramatic illustration of today's transportation requirements can be found in a study made last year by the Institute of Rapid Transit. The institute computed the capital requirements for the construction of just 19 systems during this decade and came out with a grand total of $17.708 billion. This, of course, does not begin to account for the many middle-size cities also needing help, or the inevitable 10-percent annual rise in construction costs.

So, today we are really taking a step backward in the face of the transportation challenge. Even before the Congress has enacted the President's mass transit program, we will be undermining its basic foundation.

It should be noted that warnings of the vulnerability of contract authority had been sounded by those of us who opposed the President's transportation package when he first submitted it to the Congress last August. I am a sponsor of legislation providing for the establishment of a mass transportation trust fund. History has certainly proven the success of the trust fund as a reliable mechanism for long term financing. But, even while the mass transportation trust fund has over 110 House sponsors, support from the mayors and Governors and even from Secretary of Transportation John Volpe, the President rejected it and chose to send to Congress a 5-year contract authority program.

Mr. Chairman, I shall continue to vote against the funding of the SST's development on the basis of its own inadequacies. As its noise levels and cost estimates escalate, and while concern mounts over the threat it poses to the very stability of our atmosphere, it seems absurd to commit our limited resources to a project which may never have a market and which some airlines do not even seem to want.

It is time that we face the transportation crisis now before us and put our funds where they are urgently needed—into mass transit.

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

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

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

I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment, and wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman, and indicate that I believe them to be most accurate.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment because I believe that the Urban Mass Transportation Administration will have plenty of funds to spend in the coming year.

The $80 million that the gentleman from New York has talked about has not been requested by the administration, it is a part of a program that may be requested when the urban mass transportation bill is passed by the Congress.

As of now, they will have the $214 million that we funded in advance last year plus $100 million that they had available from prior years, that they had not spent as of April first of this year. In other words, this coming fiscal year they will have available $314 million to spend on mass transportation.

Last year they spent considerably less, and we believe that they are adequately funded, and it will not be necessary to provide an additional $82 million in this appropriation bill. I ask for a "no" vote on the amendment.

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

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that in the testimony taken by his committee, the Department of Transportation indicated that they would be able to obligate in the next fiscal year $850 million?

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman from New York I would say that I can well understand the gentleman's interest in mass transportation. I think the country needs a mass transportation program. But the administration is not ready at this time to provide that kind of money to develop our mass transportation system until we get the pending authorization enacted. The kind of money that we have available is much more money than they have been spending in the past years, and I think it will fund a very adequate program for mass transportation.

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

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman if it is not so that the testimony brought out that there was $100 million in 1970 that had not been committed, and there was $214 million for 1971 that had not been committed, so that there is $314 million altogether that had not been committed?

Mr. McFALL. That is right. They will have $314 million to spend in the 1971 fiscal year.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, when we are talking about the mass transit needs of this country, and over 80 percent of the people live in the cities, is there not some inconsistency in saying that, using the gentleman's figures of $314 million, that that is adequate for the cities of this country when in the same bill we are appropriating something like $16 million just to put trees along the highways and $4.3 billion for highways in that same fiscal year?

Is there not something wrong about our priorities?

Mr. McFALL. I would say to the gen-

tleman that with the $314 million they will have an adequate beginning program. And if we are going to fill all of these mass transportation needs of our country we are going to need the legislation which is presently pending in the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the gentleman, the chairman of the subcommittee, why there is $330 million in this bill for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, when as late as yesterday the promoters were deadlocked on the location of a station on this subway system in the District of Columbia.

According to a newspaper, if they do not resolve this dispute over the location of a key subway station, and thus the route through the District of Columbia, construction may be delayed for 13 months.

Why is there $330 million in this bill if these people cannot get together and decide where they want to run the subway?

Mr. BOLAND. As the gentleman knows, this is the Federal share of the subway system, and hopefully these problems will be resolved.

The committee at the time we considered this bill, did not have that particular location to which the gentleman refers in dispute. It is in dispute now but we hope it will be resolved and that they can go move ahead with this important program. That is what they want to do.

It is unfortunate that WMATA is being held up at various points because of some differences.

Mr. GROSS. What would happen to the $330 million that is here being made available, if they do not resolve these differences? Will that money be frittered away in some fashion or other?

Mr. BOLAND. I would hope it will not and I am sure it will not.

As the gentleman knows, we have reduced the forward funding for the fiscal year 1972 by $38 million. The request was $188,000,000 for fiscal year 1972 and the committee reduced it by $38 million principally because of these delays. Knowing that they are not going to move ahead as rapidly as they hoped they would, and because of the delays that the gentleman referred to and other delays, we do think that the total figure, $330 million, over the next 2 years will give WMATA a sufficient amount to move the system ahead. We hope it will.

Mr. GROSS. If they cannot speedily resolve a dispute of this kind, it would be my hope that the committee next year would cut them right down to the hip pockets so far as additional Federal money is concerned.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, let me assure the gentleman that that suggestion will be considered by the committee if WMATA is not able to resolve some of these problems.

I think not only the Congress but the people of the District of Columbia are getting tired of the impasse that has been reached.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES I have asked the gentleman to yield to advise the House that I am told the motion to recommit will be a straight motion to recommit by the minority. In view of that fact, I propose to try to get a rollcall vote on the previous question in the hope that the previous question will be voted down.

I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the gentleman's rollcall vote is successful and the previous question is defeated so that a motion to recommit may be offered to strike from this bill the funds for the supersonic transport. It is incomprehensible that the Nixon administration would today support the spending of $300,000,000 for this boondoggle and then next week call upon Congress to increase the debt ceiling by $18,000,000,000. This is the worst kind of fiscal insanity and the Members of the House ought to stand up and be counted on a direct vote of this infamous SST.

Let me add, Mr. Chairman, that unless the $300 million for the SST is stricken, I will demand a rollcall vote on the bill on final passage for I want to be recorded against this kind of unconscionable spending.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert my remarks on the subject of the Yates amendment before the vote on the Yates amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT), having assumed the chair, Mr. EDMONDSON, 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. 17755) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. RHODES

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RHODES. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RHODES moves to recommit the bill H.R. 17755 to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MINSHALL. I have had a motion to recommit at the desk with instructions to take out the funds for the SST, but I understand that under the precedents and the customs of the House, being only the No. 5 man on the Appropriations Committee, I was outranked by my good friend from Arizona.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman really is not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 176, nays 162, not voting 91, as follows:

[Roll No. 146]

YEAS—176

Abernethy	Caffery	Fountain
Adair	Camp	Frey
Adams	Casey	Fulton, Tenn.
Albert	Cederberg	Fuqua
Alexander	Chamberlain	Garmatz
Anderson, Calif.	Chappell	Gettys
	Clancy	Giaimo
Anderson, Ill.	Clark	Gonzalez
Annunzio	Clausen, Don H.	Gray
Arends		Grover
Aspinall	Collins	Gubser
Ayres	Colmer	Hagan
Baring	Corbett	Haley
Beall, Md.	Corman	Hall
Belcher	Daniel, Va.	Hammer-schmidt
Bell, Calif.	Daniels, N.J.	
Bevill	Davis, Ga.	Hanley
Boggs	Denney	Hanna
Boland	Dent	Hansen, Wash.
Bray	Devine	Harsha
Brinkley	Dickinson	Harvey
Brock	Dorn	Hastings
Brooks	Downing	Hawkins
Broomfield	Edmondson	Hays
Brown, Ohio	Edwards, Ala.	Hébert
Broyhill, N.C.	Erlenborn	Hicks
Broyhill, Va.	Findley	Holifield
Buchanan	Fisher	Hull
Burleson, Tex.	Flood	Johnson, Calif.
Burton, Utah	Flowers	Johnson, Pa.
Bush	Ford, Gerald R.	Jonas
Byrnes, Wis.	Foreman	Kazen

Kee
Keith
King
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Lloyd
Long, La.
McClory
McClure
McEwen
McFall
Mahon
Mailliard
Mann
Marsh
Martin
Meeds
Meskill
Mills
Mize
Mizell
Mollohan
Montgomery
Morton
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Purcell
Quillen
Rarick
Rhodes
Rivers
Rooney, N.Y.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Sandman
Satterfield
Scott
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Steed
Staggers
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vigorito
Waggonner
Watkins
Whalen
White
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wold
Wyatt
Wyman
Young
Zablocki
Zion

NAYS—162

Addabbo
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Ashley
Barrett
Bennett
Biaggi
Bingham
Blatnik
Brademas
Brasco
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Burke, Mass.
Burlison, Mo.
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Carey
Celler
Clay
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Conte
Coughlin
Crane
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Dennis
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fish
Flynt
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gibbons
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Gude
Halpern
Hamilton
Harrington
Hathaway
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Horton
Howard
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Jones, N.C.
Kastenmeier
Kleppe
Koch
Kyros
Landgrebe
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Long, Md.
Lowenstein
Lujan
McCarthy
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McKneally
Macdonald, Mass.
Madden
Mayne
Melcher
Michel
Mikva
Miller, Ohio
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Nedzi
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Philbin
Pike
Podell
Preyer, N.C.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Quie
Reid, Ill.
Reuss
Robison
Roe
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roth
Ruth
Ryan
St Germain
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Sisk
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Stanton
Stokes
Stratton
Sullivan
Symington
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Udall
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Waldie
Wampler
Weicker
Whalley
Whitehurst
Widnall
Wolff
Wright
Wydler
Wylie
Yates
Yatron

NOT VOTING—91

Abbitt
Anderson, Tenn.
Berry
Betts
Biester
Blackburn
Blanton
Bolling
Bow
Brown, Mich.
Burke, Fla.
Burton, Calif.
Cabell
Carter
Chisholm
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Conyers
Cowger
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dowdy
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Feighan
Foley
Gaydos
Gilbert
Goldwater
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hansen, Idaho
Hogan
Hosmer
Hungate
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Kirwan
Kyl
Landrum
Langen
Lukens
McCloskey
McCulloch
McMillan
MacGregor
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Miller, Calif.
Nichols
O'Neal, Ga.
Patten
Pettis
Pollock
Powell
Railsback
Randall
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Riegle
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Roybal
Ruppe
Scherle
Schwengel
Sebelius
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Springer
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Tunney
Watson
Watts
Whitten
Wilson, Charles H.
Zwach

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Randall for, with Mr. Eilberg against.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana for, with Mr. Gilbert against.

Mr. Roberts for, with Mrs. Green of Oregon against.

Mr. Dawson for, with Mr. Langen against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Matsunaga against.

Mr. Dowdy for, with Mr. McCloskey against.

Mr. Foley for, with Mr. Biester against.

Mrs. May for, with Mr. Rogers of Florida against.

Mr. McMillan for, with Mr. Rees against.

Mr. Stuckey for, with Mr. Kyl against.

Mr. Blackburn for, with Mr. Karth against.

Mr. McCulloch for, with Mr. Roybal against.

Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Reid of New York against.

Mr. Whitten for, with Mr. Culver against.

On this vote:

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Burton of California with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Tunney with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Gaydos with Mr. Ruppe.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Patten of New Jersey with Mr. Hogan.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Zwach.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Sebelius.
Mr. Hansen of Idaho with Mr. Reifel.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. O'HARA changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ASHBROOK changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GOODLING changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CLARK changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority whip the program for next week.

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

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, Monday is Consent Calendar day. There are no suspensions scheduled. The Consent Calendar will be followed by H.R. 15712, to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act, under an open rule, with 1 hour of debate; and

House Resolution 1033, attendance at International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, 1 hour of debate.

Tuesday we have scheduled the Private Calendar and House Joint Resolution 746, the Pan American Institute of Geography and History, under an open rule, with 1 hour of debate.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week:

On Wednesday, we have a joint meeting to receive the President of the Republic of Venezuela;

Then we have H.R. 17802, to increase the public debt limit, subject to a rule being granted; and

Following that, we will have the District of Columbia appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971, and the foreign operations appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971, and, finally H.R. 16065, to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act, subject to a rule being granted.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on rollcalls Nos. 137, 139, 140, and 141. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea" on rollcalls Nos. 137, 140, and 141. On rollcall No. 139, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I missed the second quorum call today, because a group of us were at the White House at a luncheon in honor of our fine Speaker, Congressman JOHN McCORMACK. I believe that is the best excuse any Member can have.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I missed a quorum call today. I was in my office with constituents on District business. I simply want to record this statement for the RECORD permanently.

WELFARE REFORM

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

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. House of Representatives recently passed the administration's welfare reform bill.

This bill has now gone to the Senate Finance Committee, which has postponed public hearings until administration officials can rework the proposal.

I strongly opposed this measure and voted against it.

I received a large number of letters from throughout my congressional district relating to this welfare proposal. Among this correspondence was a letter from Mr. J. Gurley of Grant, Ala. Mr. Gurley expresses what I believe to be the feeling of a great many people in my congressional district and in Alabama.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert Mr. Gurley's letter in the RECORD and urge all my colleagues to read it.

CATHEDRAL CAVERNS, INC.,
Grant, Ala., April 30, 1970.

Congressman TOM BEVILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEVILL: First, I want to thank you for your efforts on the behalf of us Alabamians and other Americans. Also, I appreciate your keeping us informed via the newsletter and copies of the *Congressional Record* on what is happening or about to happen to us, the subjects of an all powerful government.

Your most recent news item covering the *Family Assistance Act* with the guaranteed income provision, is cause for concern, great concern, among those of us who have grown accustomed to working for our bread.

I am 47 years of age and have been practically on my own since the age of 8, when Dad began to go broke during the depression. I remember, all too well, picking cotton and being paid at the rate of 15c to 25c per hundred pounds picked. A hundred pounds was a full days work for most of us. I also remember well, of maybe, having an orange to celebrate the spirit of Christmas. Looking back upon this, maybe I was underprivileged.

There was little time for schooling. During the summer months, I mowed lawns, gathered up scrap iron, (to be sold to Japan), picked up cigarette butts, and even stole a little. In the Fall, I picked cotton and corn, gathered Pecans, Walnuts, and Hickory nuts. Also there were odd jobs around the cotton gin, sawmill and the hamburger joints where we got a handout. I drove a log truck at the age of 12–13, for $4.00–$5.00 a week. I was free to go to school for a little while in the Spring. I suppose I would be called a dropout, today. In my spare time, I had a newspaper route. All this means that I have been working for about 39 years, paying "Social Security" and most other taxes since their conception.

After World War II, I got a little schooling under the GI Bill and with a lot of sacrifice and effort have become president of my own corporation. Now, because of inflation and depression, high wages and high taxes, plus high interest rates—all of this is about to go down the drain.

The day that this "guaranteed income" bill goes into effect, is the day that I plan to "retire" and live off the efforts and sacrifices of captive idiots who continue to work! My wife and I are tired of 24 hours a day effort and responsibilities. We are tired of our employees making more for a 40 hour week than we make for a 168 hour week.

We are tired of all the other responsibilities and obligations that go along with this farce of "owning your own business." We are tired of having nothing left over, and of robbing Peter to pay Paul, just to keep the business in operation.

So, please hurry and pass this bill. Let those of us who are just plain sick and tired of our "no guts" government, quit work, get out of the way, and stop being a bad influence on these animals and savages of today who have only the desire to burn, loot and destroy all that they would inherit.

We brought forth upon this land, four children. We have been unable to send them to college. Two were ineligible for scholarships because they were the children of "rich parents." Our son, after 4 years service in the Air Force and five years of marriage, with the aid of his fine wife, is still working his way through college. We have little hope for the fourth, a daughter, of going to college. She will complete High School in 1971, but, she too will be subjected to all the frustrations of being handicapped by parents who have been foolish enough to try to accomplish something under our present form of government—"take it from those who work, give it to those who will not work."

I could write a book, but I know you have other things to do, so a letter will have to suffice for the time being!

From what I hear, you will certainly be reelected. Keep up the good work for a better America!

I remain, your friend, and a damned tired American.

J. GURLEY,
President.

P.S. Can you arrange for our government to take my business and pay *me* taxes? Try this arrangement for a while and I guarantee you, changes would be made!

THE TIME IS NOW FOR CONGRESS TO ENCOURAGE BUSINESS

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

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, a major domestic concern to all of us is the recent stock market slump. We in Congress, who believe in a free open market, know that we have seen this recession headed this way because of liberal, antibusiness laws. The fact is that a major cause of the slump is adverse congressional legislation.

Prosperous business builds a progressive, prosperous country. It means full employment, good pay checks, and a balanced national budget.

Many seem to forget that the money we spend in Congress is generated by profits in business. Business pays corporate income tax. It pays social security tax on wages. It pays employees who pay still more income tax. Yet for a business to pay taxes, it must run its affairs at a profit. The more profits business generates, the more taxes are produced for America.

Who can help business make more profits? Labor can play a big part. Labor leadership the other day suggested wage and price ceilings. This was an excellent, unselfish concept. Wage levels in different industries have so many differentials that this may not be practical.

Congress should develop an encouraging business incentive program. Tax incentives would be effective in exports. Tax incentives for reinvested earnings are healthy. Tax incentives to stimulate top executives are great motivators. But we passed a tax bill just a few months ago that was a monster. This tax bill that smashed business has reacted sharply.

Back on November 12, 1969, on the floor of Congress, I discussed the dangers of excess taxation on business. Let me quote from my statement that was anticipating our present dilemma:

> What this Country needs is lower taxes. We need to realize that business is the foundation of our prosperous economy. Business means jobs—and jobs are essential, as they keep people busy and in turn provide more taxable income.
>
> Let me refer to you for study the tax analysis from this middle-sized factory in Pennsylvania. The 260 employees on their payroll are the base of town economy. Wages from this factory provide jobs for grocery stores, gasoline stations, clothing stores, appliances, homebuilders, and general merchants.

I took the sales in 1968 which totaled $5,548,000. Net profit after taxes was only $106,685. But this company generated in taxes to all governments the staggering sum of $715,949 by 19 kinds of taxes.

Now let me continue with an interesting reference to stock as an investment.

> During the year, old stockholders died and passed on their stock worth $550,000. The estate consisted of land and stocks. The estate had to sell the stock to pay the $206,000 estate tax on the stock. How can the person who bought the stock repay the loan or even maintain his bank loan with 8 percent interest? Dividends were much lower than bank interest payable on the investment.
>
> Let us encourage business to make money. When business is profitable, our country is prosperous.

And now we are working on a guaranteed income bill to put more people permanently on relief. It is stated that no one should do menial work. There will be no one to mop floors in hospitals, no clerks for grocery stores, no one at service stations to run gasoline pumps, no one to work on roads. Already the national welfare group has taken over Secretary Finch's office to demand $5,500 as the minimum salary for relief. All the incentive we legislate is to not work.

Let us start discussing ways to help business. Instead of holding congressional hearings to condemn business leaders, it would add more to the economy to put out front-page recognition for new engineering development, higher sales achievements, and accounting cost savers.

Stock prices anticipate the future. America today needs optimism sparked by a friendly Congress that wants to see American business grow and develop.

One step forward would be lower interest rates. Business wants to borrow money for active working capital and expects to pay a reasonable interest rate. They ask, "Why is Congress spending in excess of $200 billion a year?"

If Congress spent less, taxed less, and had fewer giveaway programs, there would be more money available in banks to be directed toward the private sector for growth.

MARJORIE WHITEMAN

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

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, It has come to my attention that a distinguished international lawyer and a truly remarkable woman, Marjorie Whiteman, has just retired from the Department of State after 41 years of outstanding service.

Her contributions not only to the field of international law but to the conduct of foreign policy are of such a special nature that they deserve recognition by the Members of the Congress.

In 1929, when the U.S. Government was confronted with a difficult claims settlement involving substantial sums of money, the Solicitor of the Department of State, Green H. Hackworth, learned of a highly specialized legal study of international claims and State responsibility undertaken by Marjorie Whiteman, then a young graduate of the Yale Law School. She was hired the next day—an event which spearheaded a widening train of development in international law with significant effects on U.S. foreign policy for the next 41 years.

Not only has the U.S. Government been saved vast sums of money in claims settlements as a result of Marjorie Whiteman's pioneering and scholarly research in the original archives of this Government, but her study, a three-volume work entitled "Damages in International Law" is still regarded as the most definitive treatment of this subject, never having been superseded.

Marjorie Whiteman's capabilities were early recognized, as successive Secretaries of State from Cordell Hull to Dean Rusk repeatedly requested her inclusion among the U.S. delegation at international conferences where she proved of indispensable worth.

At the Inter-American Conference for Maintenance of Peace, Buenos Aires in 1936, Miss Whiteman originated and formulated the unique concept of consultation for the inter-American system. This legal concept has since developed into the vital machinery which has consistently been invoked by the American states in efforts to check the Communist subversion and aggression unleashed in Latin America throughout the 1950's and 1960's.

A recorded tribute to her value at these conferences occurred in 1948. After having been evacuated from Bogotá in the heat of the 1948 revolution, she was summoned to return immediately by Secretary of State Marshall who, along with a part of the U.S. delegation remaining behind, had been separated from the U.S. position papers for the drafting of the OAS charter. Through her skill as a lawyer, enhanced by her characteristically consistent and careful preparation of U.S. positions, she was able to render the assistance necessary for the completion of the OAS charter.

Assigned in 1958 to the Law of the Sea Conference at Geneva, Miss Whiteman was commended by Arthur Dean, Chairman of the U.S. delegation, not only for her ability as a lawyer but for her skill as a negotiator in successfully securing the signatures of other states to the Continental Shelf Convention.

These are but a few of the highlights of a dedicated career in the pursuit of law in which her excellence and brilliance contributed to still other major events of our history such as the drafting of the United Nations Charter, the Declaration of Human Rights, and the numerous Inter-American Conferences and Meetings of Consultation of Foreign Ministers of American States.

As Assistant Legal Adviser for American Republic Affairs from 1950–65, Miss Whiteman achieved one of the most successful and valued lawyer-client relationships on record. Her clients, the Bureau of American Republics Affairs, in 1958 took the initiative in nominating her for the National Civil Service League Award, which she won. At that time, she was commended for her valuable service to both the Department of State and that Bureau. Her particular value and effectiveness as a consultant was attributed by the Bureau not only to "her thorough knowledge of the law" but also to "her keen insight into political aspects of any given problem."

In addition to Miss Whiteman's three volume work, "Damages in International Law," she has authored numerous studies, some published as articles in leading law journals, but many which remain unpublished because classified or of particular application only to the U.S. Government. Miss Whiteman was a major contributor to the eight-volume Hackworth "Digest of International Law."

Miss Whiteman's career, thus combining the ideal attributes of an experienced practitioner and distinguished scholar and publicist of international law, culminated in her assignment to compile, edit, and direct the publication of a new digest of international law, carrying on a tradition of the Department of State dating from 1877. Miss Whiteman formally began work on the digest in 1957 and carried this work simultaneously with her duties as legal adviser for the Bureau of American Republic Affairs until 1965 when she devoted full time to the digest in the capacity of assistant legal adviser and counselor on international law.

Working alone for 2 years, Miss Whiteman's research reflected from the outset her vision of the unprecedented broad scope which characterizes the content of this 15 volume "Digest of International Law"—a record of the practice of international law and the application of its principles throughout the past 25 years by the nations of the world. This distinguishing feature has been uniformly acclaimed by the eminent scholars and jurists of international law who have reviewed the Whiteman digest. In the words of one British jurist, this inclusion of the practice of other governments—

> Makes it of even greater value to those in other countries whose daily work requires them to apply the principles and rules of international law to existing facts.

Secretary of State Rusk, upon receiving the first volume of the Whiteman Digest of International Law in July 1963, stated:

> This volume and the ones to come, will fill an important gap in the legal materials available to the United States Government, to the Bar and to the public in this country, and to Governments and scholars throughout the world. We are grateful to you, Miss Whiteman, for undertaking the preparation of the Digest of International Law, and for the intensive work you have done and have directed over several years, to see the task through to completion. . . .

The American Society of International Law, bestowing its 1965 Annual Award upon Miss Whiteman, commented:

> In it [the first three volumes of the Whiteman *Digest*] Miss Whiteman, Assistant Legal Adviser of the Department of State, has brought together published sources and manuscript archives showing the practice of the United States, judicial decisions on international law (from American, foreign, and international courts), pertinent documentation of international organizations, and relevant extracts from American and foreign books and articles. She has diligently ferreted out material, selected and compressed it with skill, and synthesized the whole in a manner which tells the story of contemporary international law as viewed by an active participant who is at the same time an erudite and objective scholar. The reader will note an emphasis less peculiarly American, and more truly international in approach and scope, than in the earlier *Digests* issued by our Government. . . .
>
> All of us concerned with, or interested in, international law—whether as student, teacher, scholar, lawyer, social scientist, practitioner of foreign relations, or citizen seeking to become informed about the world in which we live—will find these volumes invaluable.

In commending the Whiteman Digest of International Law as a "most valuable service to the international community" and "as without parallel and unrivaled in its utility to international lawyer," reviewers, both domestic and foreign, have without exception lauded the author variously, in terms of her "breadth of experience," "judicious selection of right quotations," "appreciation of the significant trends in international law today," "prodigious labour," "intelligence," "unexcelled scholarship" and "admirable dedication."

In 1966, Miss Whiteman was awarded the Department of State's distinguished Honor Award which cited her—

> For signal achievement in the compilation and edition of her masterful "Digest of International Law", the first five volumes

of which are already widely acclaimed and used throughout the world; for many other outstanding achievements in nearly four decades of dedicated service, such as the drafting of the Charter of the Organization of American States and the Rio Pact; and for her vision, intellectual integrity, and achievement for world-wide recognition as an authority on international law.

At her retirement reception on March 30, 1970, the present legal adviser, John R. Stevenson, read the following excerpt from a letter written by Herman Phleger, the legal adviser who launched Miss Whiteman in the writing of the Digest of International Law:

Marjorie is unique. She has great intellectual endowments, is untiring in her work of scholarship, is unmatched in her dedication to public service, and with it all is modest and unassuming, and bears her honors lightly. She has made a major contribution to the progress of international law in her Digest of International Law.

Through a lifetime of dedicated service distinguished by sustained excellence, Miss Whiteman has reached the acme of an individual's contribution to the American commitment of Government under law in presenting to the world the Whiteman Digest of International Law. As a result, the United States has been credited with having taken the lead in advancing the development of international law.

THE NATION'S ECONOMY

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we have been devoting our efforts to arresting inflation in this country anticipating that the admitted problems of inflation would cause us serious troubles. Those troubles are already with us and as we read the papers and as we hear what happened on the New York Stock Exchange and the other stock exchanges around the country, we find that the indications are telling us that inflation is our sole problem. These indications tell us that we can anticipate a decline in business, a further tightening of credit, a failure of sources of funds necessary for continued capital improvement and development, loss of jobs, unemployment, and all of the problems that many of us remembered were visited upon us in overwhelming measure after 1929.

In 1929 when a serious decline in stock prices led to margin calls and the throwing of stock on the market to be sold at any price, it was followed by a collapse of bank credit, a collapse of mortgage credit, and a collapse of personal credit—people were out of business and could not pay their business obligations. About a year and a half after the stock market crash of 1929, we found real estate values diminishing to the vanishing point, a complete lack of availability of any mortgage money, unemployment, and a business recession euphemistically termed a depression which for those without jobs was really a collapse of their personal world.

The stock market is no longer the play field of a monied few. The number of stockholders runs into many millions and the market affects the lives of those who save by investment; those who save by purchase of mutual funds and those who save in banks. As the banks have made loans secured by stocks and as these loans become precarious, the entire credit structure of this country is affected. As an indicator, this affects the opinions of our investors, our savers, and businessmen alike and this forecast of what will happen as the country's economy continues in the way it is heading must not be ignored.

If businessmen are to continue high employment and plans for development building new and more efficient plants, they must know that credit is available and they must know that they may profit from this development or they will not enter into these commitments. Retrenchment affects not only the company which retrenches; it affects others and this is not unlike the chain reaction which we know culminates in the explosion of the atomic bomb.

This is not the time for us to be concerned only about inflation. This is the time for us to take courageous steps to recognize the message we are being given. If we are to avoid failures of brokerage firms, failures of banks and industrial firm bankruptcies with their spreading effects on individual savings, individual incomes and purchasing power, and employment, we must recognize that it is time for this Government to restore the confidence of the investor, the businessman, and the members of the public.

In 1929 Congress and the administration were unable to work together. The Federal Reserve bank was unable or unwillingly to expand the credit available in the economy and stood by passively while the stock market crash was followed by the credit collapse which is foretold. The Federal Reserve banks have the power to make credit available to the banks and through the banks to the public. For them to act at this time would be helpful in substantial measure, but even more substantial would be the restoration of confidence in the economy, the restoration of confidence in businessmen and a turnaround in the all too prevalent feeling that the country is about to collapse. These emotional factors cannot be disregarded. Let us not forget that businessmen are people; they act in accordance with what they think is going to happen and they must know that there is a reasonable possibility that their plans and programs will be successful or they will not take the first step.

We have been addressing ourselves to urban development, providing housing and to recognizing and remedying our environmental problems. I say to you that we cannot solve these problems with a collapsed economy. Both the Federal Reserve bank and the administration should recognize the importance of this and the importance of a healthy economy in solving these problems and should take immediate steps to create and provide the credit that will be needed to get these programs underway, to get them out of the talking stage and into the acting stage and to assure the people of this country that this Congress recognizes that an emergency does exist and that immediate action is necessary if we are going to avoid a repetition of the problems we lived through so unhappily some 40 years ago.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, one of the urgent needs of our time is that of instilling in our young people a love of their country which will be reflected in higher ideals and devoted service in the years to come. An important step in this direction was taken in my district when the United American Veterans' Organization sponsored an essay contest among the high schools of El Paso County, Tex., on the subject "Freedom's Challenge."

The veterans named as director and senior judge of the contest Dr. Bruno J. Rolak, lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army, retired, now a professor of history at the University of Texas at El Paso. Dr. Rolak was elected by the student body of U–T El Paso this year as "The Most Honored Professor of 1969–70." His work in promoting and directing the contest was outstanding.

Through a member of my staff, Mr. Jess Daffron, Jr., a graduate of Notre Dame University, I was able to arrange an award of a 1-year scholarship to Notre Dame to the winner of this essay contest. The second prize winner received a 1-year scholarship to the University of Texas at El Paso.

The judges named as the first place winner the essay by Wesley Vargas, a 16-year-old junior at Bel Air High School in El Paso. I commend this essay to my colleagues and the Nation as an excellent presentation of the challenges that face our Nation and the part which today's youth must take in meeting them.

The prize-winning essay follows:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Wesley Vargas)

The United States has been compared to the Roman Empire because of the freedom, rights and privileges given to its people through the unique form of government called democracy. Today, America can boast many achievements as in the moon walks, laser rays, heart transplants, computers, etc. It seems that we are scientifically and technically secure from a Roman Fall. This supreme confidence in our own abilities is evidenced all around us. But unfortunately these are only a modern form of idolatry, and salvation from growing world troubles by the vehicle of science will only prove as empty a dream as Roman prayers to Jupiter, Venus, or the Emperor.

Dr. Robert Strauss-Hupe, noted historian and international relations expert, asks, "Why did this Roman civilization decline at all? And why did it decline so rapidly that, within another 100 years, the Roman Empire was plunged irreversibly into anarchy and

penury, ravaged by foreign aggressors and doomed to extinction?" (5). The question today is "Will the same catastrophe happen to America?"

There are five major causes for the decline and fall of the Roman Empire which Edward Gibbon and other noted historians of the Roman world have written about. They are:

1. The breakdown of the family and the rapid increase of divorce.

2. The spiraling rise of taxes and extravagant spending.

3. The mounting production of armaments to fight ever-increasing threats of enemy attacks—when the real enemy was the decay of the society from within.

4. The craze for pleasure and brutalization of sports.

5. The decay of religion into myriad and confusing forms, leaving the people without a uniform guide. (1:43).

Every one of these factors is present in America today. You read it in your daily newspapers—growing incidence of divorce, broken homes and juvenile delinquency, inflation and rising taxation, the pleasure binge, military-industrial complex, the startling growth of occultism and weird religions.

They are all part of our world and of our American society. There are ways of combating this decay of American civilization today. I will try to describe what I think and feel we can and should do to halt this decay.

FAMILY AND DIVORCE

Before the time of Cicero, divorces in Rome were rare, almost unknown. But then, divorces came so frequently that many Romans thought it had become a normal way of life. Jerome Carcopino quotes from Seneca, "They divorce in order to remarry. They marry in order to divorce." (2:54).

Thus, Roman marriage was only a form of legalized adultery and today we see this happening.

Early Romans possessed a principle about the family which was that the family was the base of Roman society and that the most important feature of this family group was the authority of the father. This parent taught his family how to command as well as how to obey. Today, many parents have let their children govern themselves as well as raising them as the spoiled child of society. Family life has been degraded in our modern societies simply because many families have ceased being families and are becoming public gatherings of casual acquaintances. "A family is a beautiful garden. It needs lots of careful attention—needs watering, cultivating, pruning, weeding out of wrong practices and habits. It needs *diligent work*—not just casual, accidental, thoughtless appearance" (7:4).

Fathers should take more notice of what their sons and daughters do all day; be understanding and talk with them about their daily activities. Fathers should become masters in their household once more and teach their family how to become once more what our forefathers were made of. Mothers should stay home to raise their children instead of seeking emancipation from home life. Being a mother is a tremendous job because she teaches her child right or wrong, hate or love, and that knowledge that he will use in his future life. In all, there must be communication and love. This is what I feel that our American parents should do to make their home a beautiful garden.

EXTRAVAGANT SPENDING

"Prosperity, it seems, can be a very deceptive thing—a continuous chasing after the mythical bucket of gold at the end of the rainbow." (1: 41). Money may be tight but with the use of credit cards, it is becoming easier to obtain more items and comforts that one would normally need to go through life. With this kind of affluence, the spoiled child puts the family in debt and on the brink of ruin. The situation causes a crisis when everybody wants to have fun and to enjoy the father's hard earned money, and this is now possible through the easy use of the credit cards. With this mania for spending, workers ask for a higher salary demanding more for their work and wanting more security. While these workers obtain a higher salary, taxes go up and consume more of the U.S. dollar. Latest statistics show that all U.S. taxes combined consume 37 cents out of every dollar of national income (1:43). Much of this money goes to maintain the best armed military services of the world, to build beautiful cities but mostly, to support the vast bureaucracy of government on all levels. Nearly one in every five jobs are governmental supported jobs (1:43).

The best thing to do is to stop asking for higher wages and this will stop the crazy cycle of inflation. This will need the cooperation of the unions which seem only to care about its members instead of the community which will come out on the short end of the stick.

Welfarism is making more people lazier. Phillip Van Ness Myer writes, "The evils that resulted from this misdirected state charity can hardly be overstated. Idleness and all its accompanying vices were fostered to such a degree that we probably shall not be wrong in enumerating the practice as one of the chief causes of the demoralization of society at Rome under the emperors." (6: 523).

Just imagine how many able-persons here in the United States just sit around the house and wait for the welfare check to arrive. I think there are persons that don't want to look for jobs because they know that society will see that they are given aid. There are many cases in which people can't go to work because they are ill, or unskilled or handicapped, but there should be a strict application for those who seek welfare. There should also be more institutions to teach the unskilled person to obtain a job where skill should be needed. With some strict restrictions on welfarism more people will be seeking more jobs to make the family support itself.

PLEASURES

The demand for pleasure is increasing because people want to get away from their daily problems. This is an attempt to "Escape" from reality and world problems. William Davis writes, "The Roman Empire and the Roman order of things were considered indestructible, eternal. . . . And so in this dream of the absolute fixity of the Roman system, men went on getting, studying, enjoying, dissipating—doing everything except to prepare for fighting." (4:314, 317).

Today, many Americans don't care what's happening around them. They are content just as long as they are happy and living the way they want to. Life became too complex for the average Romans, who turned to games and spectacles because that was what they knew and what they liked most. This is the way Americans today look toward the complications of life. There is also more hunger for violence and sex in television and in movies. Some people want to kid themselves and others want to enjoy themselves.

There is today more time for people to seek pleasure. The strength and vitality of our nation's productive machinery is declining. For years, the exports were greater than imports but now this tide has changed to more imports than exports. Lipscomb Davis says about this situation, "It is my conviction that the fundamental reason is that we in America have lost the essential ingredient of competition; namely, the willingness to work." (3:1).

Instead of going to games, watching television or doing other things of no importance, the families should be together unified to build a sound character of the type that was once the basis for the greatness of Rome. No one will ever escape from reality, nor will they find protection, by refusing to face the facts of this day in which we live.

DECAY OF SOCIETY

"The empire was made up of hundreds of cities; but the citizens of these towns, with very few exceptions, took neither pride nor interest in imperial affairs . . . Men were no longer willing to die or to live either for their city or the empire" (6:449,451). This lack of willingness of men to fight for their country brought the destruction in Rome. This is seen in our time: some of our men are deserting the army, fleeing from the draft because they lack spirit to fight for their country.

In the early stages of America, all the people were devoted to maintain and build up his country. Now, the majority of all Americans have an attitude of "Do your own thing." Many of the young Americans turn to radicalism, to communism, drugism and anything contrary to the standards of our society.

America leads the world in broken homes, crime, juvenile lawlessness and many other things that should never be seen in a great nation like the United States. America, once a peaceful land, has become a leader in civil disorders. We largely ignore the cause and the effect. America, paradoxically, has become its own enemy. America also leads in pornography, in sex and everything that concerns sex. It seems to me that we don't care anymore for a national goal or even have a direction or purpose in life.

We need to develop a strong, vibrant character that was once seen in the Roman Republic. They had a national character of quality and moral excellence and worked to see their nation grow and prosper. "Good character is based on self-sacrifice, on construction and building, on dedication to high national goals and purposes (1:6)."

In former President Eisenhower's State of the Union message in 1960, he said, "A rich nation can for a time without noticeable damage to itself pursue a course of self-indulgence, making its single goal the material ease and comfort of its own citizens. But the enmities it will incur, the isolation into which it will descend, and internal, moral, and physical softness that will be engendered will in the term bring it to disaster." (1:7).

The only way to change the fabric of our society is to render service to our nation, to seek strength rather than security and seek character ahead of profit. Character is a very important step, but there is also a God in Heaven that blesses obedience and punishes disobedience.

DECAY OF RELIGION

The decay of religion, I think and feel, is the most important problem to solve and one that God is taking into account. Many people are making new, weird religions to escape their problems but they are just getting further away from God. Chastity and virtues are no longer considered essential for a happy life. There are many people that still go to church but how many of them have the simple faith of Jesus and his preaching "Love thy neighbor."

To solve our problems, and to renew our moral and ethical principles is to wake up our personal faith in Jesus. People will see that with God they will have a changed personality, character, and all the vital characteristic to make a better person as well as a better American.

World problems are an extension of our individual problems. The world cannot change as long as we remain the way we are. The need is for a quiet revolution—that need is for a drastic change—and only

God, through Christ, can remake us into the people we ought to be.

With this kind of character we will be once more the kind of persons that made this country what it was ten years ago. And we wouldn't have to worry about falling like Rome.

CONCLUSION

I have tried to show that our American society is deteriorating but also that we can once more regain our traditional national character to make America what it was destined to be. I hate to be in a place where many Romans found themselves when they fell from power. The only way to avoid this is to have a strong, unified family with strong authority from both parents. Teach the child pride in his nation and help him make it the best. We should spend less money on comforts, a main reason why our society is being spoiled. And the main thing, which is the most important step to secure our freedom and be once more a nation of tremendous character, is to return to God. Let God lead us, let God do his will and mainly listen to him. We should return to God as our basis of life.

These things that I have mentioned are not projects that can be carried out through money; they are individual projects. The main challenge to freedom is at home.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Armstrong, Garner Ted and Gene H. Hogberg. "Modern Romans" *The Plain Truth*, XXXIV (August, 1969), pp. 6,7,41,43.

2. Carcopino, Jerome. *Daily Life in Ancient Rome*. New York: American Book Company, 1959.

3. Davis, Lipscomb. "Which Way America?" *Christian Economics*, XXII (March 31, 1970), pp.1.

4. Davis, William Stearn, *The Influence of Wealth in Imperial Rome*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1964.

5. *Los Angeles Herald Examiner*, February 9, 1969.

6. Myers, Phillip Van Ness. *Rome: Its Rise and Fall*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1962.

7. Walter Eugene and A. B. Billingsley. "Happy Family" *The Plain Truth*, XXXIV (October, 1969), pp. 1.

TESTIMONY BY FORMER ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE PAUL C. WARNKE

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the House Foreign Affairs Committee has just heard testimony from former Assistant Secretary of Defense Paul C. Warnke, who was Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs. In an excellent statement he outlined his views as to where American security interests lie. Because it is such a good statement I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF PAUL C. WARNKE

President Nixon's Foreign Policy Message bears the subtitle: "A New Strategy for Peace." Now, just three months after its issuance, the nation is divided and disrupted by the strategy of wider war in Indochina. Many of our citizens question whether our national security requires that American troops continue to fight and die in Southeast Asia. Some ask in how many other instances our foreign policy may be deemed to require the commitment of American troops. They challenge the apparent readiness to rely, in today's world, on military force to achieve policy objectives.

The underlying issue is whether we yet have a foreign policy which fits the 1970's, both in its relevance to our international interests and in its ability to attract wide-based popular support, without which no foreign policy for the 70's can be successful.

There was a time, even in the very recent past, when foreign policy was regarded as an occult field that must be entrusted to the President of the United States and his expert advisers, buttressed perhaps by the obscure writings of a few academicians. Indeed, there was a growing assumption that even the Congress of the United States had little place in the development and execution of the foreign affairs of the United States. It might perhaps advise, but there was a developing tradition of an almost Constitutional duty to consent.

Vietnam has changed dramatically this attitude of passive acceptance. The almost plenary authority of the President in the field of foreign relations is receiving serious review, in particular as it involves the power to commit our armed forces. Vietnam, of course, remains a special case and so much has been said and written about it that little new or constructive can be contributed to the debate. What I would like to do, however, is to discuss briefly with you the question of our developing perception of our real national security interests and how this perception relates to the general principles set forth in the President's foreign policy statement. We can also consider how these principles are given meaning by the current conduct of foreign affairs.

Basically, there is today a demand for broader participation in the formulation of American foreign policy. This demand, as I see it, stems from two sources. The first is the major dissatisfaction with our involvement in Vietnam and a feeling that there must be something wrong with a foreign policy that got us in but can't get us out. The second is that now, for the first time in the history of the Republic, there is genuine competition for resources between national defense expenditures and domestic demands.

At one time, the unchallenged assumption was that we could afford for defense any amount that might be necessary to ensure that we had the best and the most in the way of military hardware. We were, moreover, ready and even eager to use our resources to prepare against quite remote external threats. We lacked the same feeling of urgency when it came to internal social needs. We lacked, in many instances, even a program to meet a problem in the domestic sector. Under these circumstances, a billion dollars spent on defense did not mean a billion dollars or even half-a-billion dollars diverted from some domestic demand. The choice was not one among competing national priorities but basically between a higher defense budget or lower taxes.

Moreover, in the 50's and through most of the 60's we viewed the Soviet Union and international Communism as the overriding threat to our national security. Conditioned by the Cold War, the thinking majority of the American public believed that unless we took every step to contain Communism we would find ourselves an isolated bastion of freedom in a hostile world. In such a world, we knew we could not survive as the kind of free society we have been and want to remain.

The President's Foreign Policy Message notes the great change in the pattern of international politics and the disintegration of the Communist monolith. But its defense of the current Vietnam policy and program seems based on the old Cold War view of the threat to the United States. President Nixon has suggested that our disengagement in Vietnam would be regarded as an indication of weakness that would lead to renewed Soviet pressure in the Middle East and Western Europe and even to violence in the Western Hemisphere. If indeed international Communism is our major security threat today, then we would indeed have to remain involved militarily in Indochina whatever the cost and whatever the duration.

But there are some who would question that this view of the world in the 1970's is a correct one. Dr. Jeremy Stone has suggested that today only one country finds itself surrounded by hostile Communist states. That's the Soviet Union. The President's Message notes the real and serious differences between the two Communist giants and the fact that the Red Army has been used since World War II only against Soviet allies in Eastern Europe. In today's world, there are some who believe deeply that the major threats to our national security derive from internal inequities—not external aggression. The growing prevalence of this view is largely responsible for the current demand for participation in the development and execution of American foreign policy.

With the mounting dissent about U.S. foreign policy has come the charge that this division encourages our enemies and threatens our objectives. No doubt it does. But more important is the question whether the policy and the objectives are sound when they are at odds with the views of a sizeable segment of a free society.

I cannot pose as an expert in the assignment of national priorities. My experience has led me to believe, further, that no one can safely pose as an expert in the field of foreign policy. All opinions on that subject should be regarded as highly suspect. There are, however, a few facts that I believe can be accepted.

The first of these is that only one nation possesses the power to threaten us militarily. Only the Soviet Union has a nuclear capability which could absorb an American attempt at a preemptive strike and still destroy us utterly as a civilized society. Only the Soviet Union possesses the conventional military forces to threaten the vital strategic interests of the United States. China may someday have that amount of nuclear armament and that kind of conventional capability. But any such power is for China far in the future and we need not prepare to cope with it today with technology that would be obsolete long before it conceivably could be needed.

The ultimate aim of our foreign policy of the 1970's, therefore, must be to avoid the confrontation with the Soviet Union that could lead to the ultimate crisis for us and for the world. It is, for me, at least, impossible to determine from its generalities whether the President's Foreign Policy Message contains the principles best adapted to prevent that confrontation and avoid that crisis.

The report dwells at some length on the "Guam" or "Nixon" doctrine. But I am still unclear what this doctrine means. It asserts that we keep our treaty commitments, but does not explain what we consider those commitments to be. Are they absolute and self-executing? Or can they be construed in terms of our current self-interest? As a second point, the doctrine states that we will "provide a shield if a nuclear power threatens the freedom of a nation allied with us, or of a nation whose survival we consider vital to our security and the security of the region as a whole." But it does not clarify when and what we will consider as the threats to the freedom of others or whether we may respond with nuclear weapons to conventional aggression by a nuclear power.

The third element in the doctrine is that in the case of other types of aggression, which I assume to be by non-nuclear powers, we shall furnish military and economic assistance but the country threatened will have the primary responsibility of providing manpower for its defense. Does this envision American intervention in local disputes where neither Russia nor China is involved? It may be that the Nixon doctrine in fact signals a lower profile and a predisposition against American military involvement. But, by its terms, it is fully consistent with an American role as peacekeeper for the entire world. Indeed it is more consistent with a cut-rate Cold War strategy than with a new strategy for peace in the world of the 1970's.

What we must determine, I believe, is whether vital American security interests depend upon the nature of the political and economic institutions in most or even many of the countries of the world. Experience has led us to believe, and I think correctly, that our own national security would be jeopardized if the people and the potential of Western Europe were to fall under the domination of a hostile power. I think the Soviet Union knows this is our view. We must be sure it continues to recognize this fact. But Southeast Asia isn't Western Europe. And certainly China today is not synonymous with the Soviet Union. I doubt that we need to worry any more about the close-in containment of China or extension of Chinese influence. Whatever finally happens in Vietnam won't help China solve its massive problems or threaten a thriving Japan. In these circumstances, we can adopt a program of American military disengagement and view with equanimity the political compromise that such a program would make inevitable. The threat to our security comes from continuation of the conflict.

In the world of the 1970's, we have to find an American role which is consistent with world realities and domestic needs. This role should not, in my opinion, be that of a roving unilateral peacekeeper either in Asia or anywhere else. The peacekeeping role—to be accepted by those whom we would pacify, and to be supported by the American people—must be shared with others in a genuine international effort.

As a unilateral effort, however, our security demands that we maintain the capacity to deter the Soviet Union from use of its military force against our interests. Any Soviet use of its great military power must for us be a source of major concern This is true even when, as in Czechoslovakia, Soviet forces are used to maintain the Soviet dominion in Eastern Europe which has existed for more than two decades. We are quite rightfully concerned about Soviet pilots in Egypt and Russian willingness to play a direct role, however minor, in the violence of the Middle East. But perhaps we might reflect on the possibility that the Soviet Union is similarly concerned at American willingness to go to war in East Asia to advance Western influence.

The President's report refers to this as the era of negotiation. If there is to be genuine movement from confrontation to negotiation, we might also consider the importance of an atmosphere of calm and confidence. In the past few weeks, some have insisted that Presidential power to deploy American military forces must remain untrammeled to preserve the principle of unpredictability By this thinking, what will keep the Communists in line is their inability to guess when and where we may resort to military violence. I find this concept not only unpersuasive but frightening. In a bipolar world where we and the Russians have offsetting military strength, the prime characteristics of a sane foreign policy would seem to be consistency and caution. As the Message states: "Peace requires confidence."

The foreign policy message also states that "our commitment to peace is most convincingly demonstrated in our willingness to negotiate our points of difference in a fair and businesslike manner with the Communist countries." I think we would all agree, but I think we should also recognize that it is neither fair, nor businesslike, nor even intelligent for either side to try and scare the other into concessions. Effective agreements only can be reached if subsequent behavior can be predicted with reasonable reliability. And efforts to bargain by threats will yield no bargain, but only more threats.

Productive negotiation could yield today a degree of security unattainable by military means. Major areas are the limitation of strategic arms, the damping down of the fire in the Middle East and the lessening of tension through mutual reduction of the opposing military forces in Europe. In none of these areas will "scare tactics" on either side do anything but destroy the chances of reaching agreement.

The so-called SALT talks on limiting nuclear armaments are unquestionably the most important current development on the international scene. If we are able to reach an effective agreement, we can avoid the enormous costs of continuing the nuclear arms race and the enormous risks involved in more, and even more awesome, technological developments. Neither side will negotiate from weakness. Only the fact of rough nuclear equality makes negotiations even possible. But if each side tries to better its position in order to negotiate from greater strength, the talks on arms limitation will become a vehicle for arms escalation. Our response to Soviet threats is more weapons, not more concessions. We might expect their response to be the same.

Similarly, I do not think we advance the hopes for peace in the Middle East by widening the scope of the conflict in Indochina. Where neither we nor the Soviets can bend the other to its will, force must be expected to beget force and impetuosity to breed impetuosity. The confidence of our allies, particularly the Western Europeans, depends upon their faith in our consistency of purpose and the predictability of our response. When they see us resorting precipitately to military escalation, I doubt that they are heartened by the thought that we are keeping the Russians off-balance. They may perhaps be led instead to question the dependability of our NATO guarantees.

And, in the absence of a modern and moderate foreign policy, such fears might well be justified. The American public will not, in my opinion, continue to support the use of American force in causes of dubious importance to our national security. They may be hard to persuade that American survival or the avoidance of World War III somehow depends on the fate of any weak and unresponsive government that happens to be non-Communist. A policy that finds threats everywhere lessens the credibility of genuine threats anywhere. And improvident use of our military power can weaken our will to respond in the future even to overt aggression against our vital interests.

The need for the 1970's and beyond is a foreign policy that the thinking public can understand and respect, based on a perception of our security interests which the Soviet Union will understand and respect. Such a policy, and only such a policy, can command broad-based support. With that support, and only with that support, will come a restoration and a strengthening of effective American influence in international affairs.

UNITED STATES WINS MORE THAN MILITARY VICTORY IN CAMBODIA

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Russell Kirk in the Baltimore Sun on Monday morning, May 25, in an article entitled "United States Wins More Than Military Victory in Cambodia," points out it not only has been a very significant military victory but lists various additional advantages gained by the President's Cambodian actions. He concludes that in the long run, President Nixon's decision to act in Cambodia will be understood as a bold measure that improved our prospects for peace.

Mr. Kirk's article follows:

UNITED STATES WINS MORE THAN MILITARY VICTORY IN CAMBODIA

(By Russell Kirk)

What militant doves fail to understand, just now, is this: by taking the Communist bases along the frontier of Cambodia, President Nixon has won the greatest victory of our decade-long involvement in Southeastern Asia. But perhaps some of those doves don't desire American victories; perhaps they smile upon the ideologies of Hanoi and the terrorists of the Viet Cong.

At the end of the third week of the Cambodian campaign, American and South Vietnamese forces had beaten the enemy dramatically, at small cost. More than 7,000 Communist troops had been killed, and an unknown number wounded or captured: this is the equivalent of destroying two divisions of North Vietnamese and Viet Cong. American and South Vietnamese losses were slight.

But this military achievement is only incidental to several larger successes achieved by taking the offensive along the frontier. Those other gains exceed anything accomplished by the Americans and their allies in all the long Vietnamese struggle.

First, the Nixon offensive against the Communist bases in Cambodia has made it far easier to withdraw 150,000 more American troops by the end of this year—without exposing South Vietnam to Communist conquest. Hard hit and bewildered, Hanoi's troops will be unable to undertake a counterattack along the Cambodian front for many months to come—during which time American disengagement can proceed as Mr. Nixon has scheduled it.

Second, the government and the army of South Vietnam have been mightily heartened by this victory, and can act with more confidence and better prospect of continuing success than ever they enjoyed before. They soon should be able to assume most of their own defense.

Third, the Cambodian government at Phnom Penh, headed by Gen. Lon Nol, has been saved from the Communist onslaught. That government has been given precious time in which to organize effective resistance to Viet Cong and North Vietnamese forces. Time was mostly what the Cambodia needed; for the Kymers, detestation of Vietnamese should suffice to squelch a guerrilla war like that in Vietnam, provided that Lon Nol is able to repulse in this hour of crisis the 40,000 Communist troops that have invaded his country.

Fourth, the Communists' stocks of munitions and food have been captured, in vast quantity, and their bases in eastern Cambodia have been overrun. Withdrawn to the interior of Cambodia, the enemy soon will be desperately short of ammunition and rice. And our forces have cut, at least temporarily, the routes by which supplies come down through Laos.

Fifth, the Nixon offensive has made it virtually impossible for the Communists to mount any assault upon the neighborhood of Saigon until the monsoons are over. And the Viet Cong in the Mekong Delta are cut off from reinforcements and supplies.

Sixth, Hanoi and the Viet Cong have suffered a vast loss of face throughout

Southeastern Asia. Not only Cambodia, but Thailand and other states are heartened to resist the Communists—who now clearly are vincible, when one carriers the war to them.

Finally, Soviet Russia has been informed, through this Cambodia action, that the United States is not a feeble giant: that America can strike promptly and with great power, when necessary. This will diminish the Russian proclivity to aid the Arab states against Israel; and it should incline Moscow toward more serious negotiations in the SALT talks and elsewhere. In the long run, President Nixon's decision to act in Cambodia will be understood as a bold measure that improved the prospects for peace.

PROPOSED NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON INFLATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago, the Speaker and the majority leaders of the Senate and the House called on the President to convene a national conference on inflation and unemployment.

In line with the President's recently expressed feelings, they sought to keep the rhetoric cool. In an expression of concern over continued inflation and rising unemployment, they sought to encourage the White House to take the step of calling such a conference for two basic purposes:

First. To demonstrate this Government's concern, and to act to restore confidence in the Government and the economy. This Nation's economy remains basically strong, and the capacity is sufficient to meet today's demands if we only retain confidence in our abilities and face up to our responsibilities.

Second. To sincerely seek, from all interested segments of the economy—not just the business interests—ideas, proposals, expressions and agreement on how best to face the very serious problems of persistent inflation, rising unemployment, and business deterioration. Business and labor, investors and managers, economists and farmers, and certainly the unemployed should be made participants.

The distinguished chairman of the other party, who serves in this body and knows the problems we face, has said he has no objections to such a conference. Let us hope he can convince the President.

In calling for the conference, our leaders asked for action from the administration, not more words. Unfortunately, up to this point, that suggestion has been met by the same tired rhetoric we have been hearing for over a year.

The latest economic statistic, that of another sharp increase in the wholesale price index, only adds to our concern. How much more evidence needs to be piled atop the already overwhelming indicators that we are in a recession, that inflation has not slowed down despite rising unemployment?

The White House dinner tonight with business leaders is a small step, I suppose. It is at least more recognition by this administration than has been shown previously that there is great general concern over the economy.

I hope, however, that this highly publicized gathering is not offered as a substitute for what is sorely needed: A national conference on inflation and unemployment that embraces all segments of our economy and our Government.

Once again, we call on the President to act. Certainly a conference to seek answers and directions is little enough to ask.

PRISONERS OF WAR NEED OUR HELP

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

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, we have heard in recent weeks a great deal of concern expressed by many Americans about our Nation's policies in Southeast Asia. It goes without saying that we all want a just and responsible peace and that we all want American troops brought home as soon as this can be reasonably accomplished.

However, I have long been concerned that in our quest for peace we might lose sight of another vital effort—that of bringing back home Americans who are prisoners of war in North Vietnam.

This concern is shared by many other Americans, who are attempting individually and through organized efforts to obtain freedom for these people, many of whom have suffered from cruel and inhumane treatment during their captivity.

Back in September of last year, I introduced a resolution in this House urging North Vietnam and the Vietcong to comply with the tenets of the Geneva Convention and provide more humane treatment of American prisoners of war in Communist prison camps.

To date, we have not even been able to accurately ascertain how many American men are actually held in these camps. The Department of Defense has estimated there are at least 15 of these men who are from my home State of Utah. And stories in the press, quoting what are thought to be reliable sources, indicate there may be as many as 1,500 Americans for whom the conflict in Vietnam has resulted in capture and imprisonment under barbaric and uncivilized conditions.

All over this Nation, there are active groups of concerned individuals, including the wives and families of prisoners of war, who are trying to awaken us to action on behalf of these fellow Americans. We in the Congress can do no less than act with these people.

My resolution calls for specific compliance with provisions of the Geneva Convention pact, which North Vietnam signed in 1957, including identification of prisoners, free exchange of mail between POW's and their families, impartial inspection of prison camps and release of seriously ill or injured prisoners.

At this point, I would like to insert in the RECORD two articles appearing recently in newspapers in my home city of Ogden, San Diego, and in Washington, D.C.:

[From the San Diego Union, May 16, 1970]

ARMED FORCES DAY, 1970—PARADES DO NOT TELL FULL STORY

The men, the women and the weapons making up the military strength of the United States of America will be highly visible throughout the nation on this Armed Forces Day. We will see them in parades, on their bases and aboard their ships.

It is a timely opportunity for a renewal of our understanding of what the armed services consist, and more important, what they mean to our nation.

With the wealth of communication flowing through our society, it is ironic that clear channels are lacking to provide an understanding of the level of sacrifice our servicemen are making and the reasons they are called upon to make it.

We have seen demonstrations, in the name of peace, against symbols of our military power, as if there were any question that this power was not deployed throughout the world in the cause of peace, justice and freedom. We have heard peace demanded impatiently in our streets, as if our men striving for peace on the other side of the world were not even more impatient to conclude their task and return home.

What we will witness with pride in Armed Forces Day parades today is less significant than what we will not see. Spit and polish give our Armed Forces an inspiring luster here at home that is, in a way, deceptive.

Their real environment is the peril of combat in the jungle of Vietnam, the monotony of a snowswept Arctic air base, the throbbing, acrid world of a destroyer engineroom in the torrid zone.

Most poignant of all must be our realization that our Armed Forces include more than 1,300 men for whom this day will grind most slowly—from another sunrise to another bleak sunset in a prison compound in North Vietnam. For them no brass will glitter, no bands will play.

The hope we keep alive for their safety and ultimate return to freedom, the hope which we pray has not withered in their hearts, lies with their comrades-in-arms who remain free to carry on the struggle for a just peace.

Appeals to decency, efforts to marshal international opinion on behalf of the prisoners, even personal journeys abroad by friends and wives, have left their North Vietnamese captors unmoved. We see again that the Communists will respond only to resolution and leverage exercised by those with both the courage and the power to challenge them.

It is the strength of our Armed Forces that is deciding the contest between freedom and oppression in Southeast Asia, a contest visibly moving toward the peace we all seek. This is the same power that stands in the way of inhumane aggression elsewhere on the front lines of the free world.

The Armed Forces of the United States, a compound of skill and dedication, courage and selfless loyalty, stand between us and a force that would destroy all we hold dear. We can look to them today with gratitude and confidence.

O'er the ramparts they watch.

PUBLIC SUPPORT SOUGHT TO AID AMERICAN POW'S

ATLANTA, GA.—A tall, grey-eyed young Atlanta dentist wishes the American people would care. About "I Care."

"There are 1,500 brave men over there, in

North Vietnamese prisons, kept in cages and underground caves fit only for pigs," says Dr. John Linder with an indignant shake of his head.

The 26-year-old dentist is trying to stir up indignation in others—millions of others—to bring them "out of apathy into commitment" by getting them to write letters to Hanoi, or sign "I Care" petitions.

HAVE SUPPORT

The petition reads simply: "I care about the inhumane treatment our men are receiving as prisoners in Southeast Asia. You have my support in your efforts to bring relief to them."

Eventually, these petitions will be sent to Texas multimillionaire Ross Perot, who is organizing a nationwide truck pickup to send millions of them to Hanoi.

Thus far, Linder has 10,000 petitions which he admits is below expectations, but 500-600 are coming in every few days. And the "I Care" movement, started three months ago, already has spread to Minneapolis, St. Louis and Dayton, Ohio.

"I Care" seeks the release of the names of all prisoners, more humane treatment for them and inspection of prisons by the International Red Cross.

"Public support is the only voice to which Hanoi will listen," Linder said in an interview in his small, modern paneled office.

Every concession granted thus far concerning American prisoners has been in response to massive public opinion, said Linder.

"In the six and a half years of the war, prior to last Thanksgiving only 100 American prisoners' names—out of more than 1,400 missing—were known.

PUBLIC AROUSED

"Since public concern has been aroused by wives of those men and by Ross Perot who tried unsuccessfully to deliver Christmas gifts to the prisoners, that number of known prisoners has been nearly doubled.

"At least 100 other names have been released. But of more than 1,400 men, that's not enough."

Linder says he has been haunted by "these forgotten men" since his wife's uncle, Lt. Col. Don Paxton, was shot down over Laos in February, 1969.

"We've never heard from him since," he said. "He was a close friend of mine. I set around for a year, wondering what could be done to find out if he was alive or not.

"Then one night we were sitting home with friends, thinking about what we could do. We got to talking. And the idea came.

"We got some money from a foundation to finance 'I Care' and someone donated office space downtown. A national packaging firm donated 250 boxes for us to collect petitions in. And persons volunteered."

LOUSY RESPONSE

Up until now, the 15-man volunteer "I Care" staff has mainly sought petitions from collection boxes placed in stores around Atlanta. But that response, Linder says, "Has been lousy."

"I thought we would be deluged with them. We could get 100,000 names if we merely wanted people to sign long petitions. We don't want to do it that way. We want people to know the situation and do care."

But in the past few days, 40 churches have asked Linder for petitions for their parishioners to sign.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR—POW WIVES REPLY TO VON HOFFMAN

Nicholas von Hoffman with his vitrolic venom splattered the prisoner-of-war issue all over the pages of this newspaper last week. The League of Families of American Prisoners in Southeast Asia was stunned. They had long been seeking Washington Post publicity, hoping to arouse public opinion to the plight of their men. But not this way.

"How cruel!" one wife cried. "How could he use this issue to get across his personal point of view on the war? It's not fair."

Mr. von Hoffman's treatment of this issue was not fair. What's worse, it was not even accurate.

The League does not consider the prisoner-of-war issue political. It is a humanitarian issue that transcends whatever an individual feels personally about the war. The League is a loose-knit organization of all kinds of different people from different parts of the country with but one agonizing common bond—a relative missing in action or held prisoner in Southeast Asia. The League members themselves do not agree on the war. But there can be no disagreement on the POW issue.

Contrary to Mr. von Hoffman's insinuation that our government says North Vietnam has "kidnapped thousands of our servicemen" and holds them as "hostages," we have made no such accusations. We do not even ask for the release of these men, although we continue to pray it will be possible soon. All the League asks is: 1) a complete list of those held prisoner; 2) adequate food and medical care for prisoners; 3) release of the sick and wounded; 4) impartial inspection of prison camps; and 5) free exchange of mail between the prisoners and their families.

Nobody has ever said that "there are thousands upon thousands of our men incarcerated in North Vietnamese camps." The facts are public knowledge. There are 1,500 men missing in action in Southeast Asia—about 800 in the North, 500 in the South, and about 200 in Laos. The 800 downed in North Vietnam are all fliers, none of them draftees as von Hoffman implied.

About 400 of the 1,500 are known to be prisoners, but these names were *not* provided by the Committee of Liaison With Families of Servicemen Detained in North Vietnam, as von Hoffman states. This simply is not true.

The Committee of Liaison was formed at the request of the government in Hanoi, and its members are among the most militant of the peace groups. Although 75 per cent more mail has been sent from prison camps in the past year than in all the previous five years, only 16 new names have come out since last Thanksgiving. The Liaison Committee has said that every prisoner may write. But fewer than 200 have been heard from. The North Vietnamese say some men do not wish to write their families. It is impossible to believe that any American man imprisoned for years would deny his family the opportunity of knowing he is alive.

Mr. von Hoffman's comments about mail were misleading. POW next-of-kin have always been permitted to write letters. A six-line letter restricted to remarks about health and family members is permitted each month, although wives and parents have no way of knowing if they are received. Many have written letters for years but have never received a reply.

Packages for prisoners, however, were not accepted until Christmas of 1968. The following July, families were permitted to send a second package. It wasn't until February 1970 that families were told they could send a package every other month.

There have been American men imprisoned in Southeast Asia since March of 1964. Can you imagine the despair of a young mother who for six years has not been able to get a simple answer to her heartbreaking question: "Am I a wife or a widow?"

Perhaps Mr. von Hoffman should meet some of these families. It would give him much needed insight into a problem that cries out for editorial comment, demanding humane treatment for all prisoners-of-war, in accordance with the Geneva convention.

Let Mr. von Hoffman talk with these young wives who are living in a hellish limbo where they cannot buy or sell property; cannot borrow money for a son's college education. Let him talk to the children—the four-year-old boy who has never seen his father; or the seven-year-old girl who can't remember hers.

He should talk to one of the prisoners—one of nine released from North Vietnam in six years. Let him hear about the solitary confinement—of sitting on a bare board bunk with nothing to read, nothing to do, for hours, days, months on end. Let him hear about losing 50 pounds on the twice-a-day diet of pig fat and pumpkin soup; of never being allowed to communicate with another human being, much less his family or the outside world.

And he really should talk to H. Ross Perot, the Texas billionaire he accused of publicity seeking. Here is a man who did meet the families, was appalled by their problems, and tried to do something about it. Because he has money, he has accomplished more than the rest of us, but his motives are mistrusted. Mr. Perot has given the prisoners' families reason to hope. Von Hoffman's acid-dipped pen tried to tear that slim hope down.

The League of Families is not asking for any special privileges. All they ask is that the minimum standards of human decency be extended to those who are imprisoned, at the mercy of their captors. All they ask for themselves is the barest solace of knowing whether their husband, father, son, brothers, is alive or dead.

Why do the North Vietnamese refuse even this small concession to human decency? Even the peace groups are embarrassed by North Vietnam's continuing refusal to release the names of the prisoners they hold. No one knows why they persist in inflicting this unnecessary anguish on innocent families.

Why should wives have to travel around the world seeking the answer to that question that haunts them day and night: "Am I a wife or a widow?" Wives have appeared before the North Vietnamese delegation to the Paris peace talks, who looked them right in the eye and promised they would hear. They have not heard.

Why should wives have to deal through a Liaison Committee established by the enemy? Most of them are so desperate they would accept information from any source, but why should they be reduced to this? In no other armed conflict in history have the wives and families of military men been exploited in this cruel manner.

For years these families suffered silently. The world knew nothing of their plight. By their silence, they hoped to protect their men from harsh treatment, torture, perhaps even death at the hands of their captors. But after five years, they wearied of the lack of progress on the prisoner-of-war question. They worried about the state of their loved ones—mentally and physically. They began to speak out.

Families and friends of the 1,500 men missing in action in Southeast Asia have written thousands of letters—to newspapers, congressmen and senators, to the presidents of the United States and North Vietnam, to the United Nations and the Red Cross, to foreign governments, to everybody they could think of who might add a voice to theirs in their search for information and their demands for humane treatment for prisoners.

They have spent a year of dedicated—and courageous—effort to make this issue known to the public and to urge support for their simple humanitarian aims. Articles like von Hoffman's completely undermine their efforts. It is articles like von Hoffman's that the North Vietnamese take delight in reading to their prisoners.

Only world opinion will persuade Hanoi to change its policy on prisoners. It is known that the North Vietnamese cannot believe that the American public really cares about "just 1500 men." The words von Hoffman used are the words Hanoi uses—"just 1500 men." To the League of Families these are not "just 1500 men." The plight of these men is a personal daily hell that each family member endures as best he or she can.

The only thing the families would like to ask Mr. von Hoffman is: "What would you be writing if it were your son, your brother, who was among the missing? What would you do after years of not knowing if he were alive or dead? Just what would you do?"

BARBARA P. ONDRASIK.
Member, League of Families of American Prisoners in Southeast Asia.
ROCKVILLE.

Just last week, in Omaha, the Forgotten Americans Committee, formed in February of this year staged a mass rally to promote a massive civilian display of public concern for our men who are either prisoners of war or missing in action in Southeast Asia. Among the speakers there were two men who have firsthand knowledge of which they speak—Cmdr. Lloyd Bucher, skipper of the *Pueblo*, and Col. Norris Overly, one of nine former prisoners so far released by Hanoi.

I think that it is time for all Americans, from Members of Congress to individual citizens, to voice their concern—not only about the present actions in Southeast Asia, but about the American servicemen who are remembered by so few of our citizens because they had the misfortune to be captured and imprisoned by the Communists.

MR. JOE GRZENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, we live in a nation whose people have come to regard courage and excellence as two of the highest virtues that a human being can pursue.

Last evening in Fenway Park, one of my distinguished constituents, Mr. Joseph Grzenda, displayed in an outstanding fashion both courage and excellence. Joe is a 15-year veteran of professional baseball, specializing in relief pitching.

Mr. Chic Feldman, sports columnist for the Scrantonian-Tribune, recently pointed out the countless years of toil that Joe Grzenda has expended in the minor leagues to become a journeyman relief pitcher. Chic also brought to everyone's attention the fact that Joe Grzenda found Ted Williams's managing abilities fully to his liking.

Mr. Feldman pointed out that Joe Grzenda considers Ted Williams "a most intelligent gentleman who always has the progress of the game in his grasp." As long ago as April 12, Chic Feldman predicted that Joe's talents could make the Washington Senators strong contenders.

Last night in Boston, Ted Williams must have heard that prophecy. After 105 starts as a relief pitcher, Manager Williams called on Joe Grzenda to make his first major league start. As the Washington Post said, "he pitched the best game in his 33 years."

Going into the ninth inning, he had a one-hitter and five of those innings were pitched in perfect fashion. Joe, of course, was credited with winning his first major league start.

So, I am proud today to salute Joe Grzenda of the 10th Congressional District of Pennsylvania for an evening in which he displayed both the highest traits of courage and excellence.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a Nation. The United States is the world's largest producer of silver ore. In 1966 the United States produced 1,358 metric tons of silver ore compared to 1,037 produced by Canada, the second ranked nation.

CAMPUS CONFRONTATION: POLITICAL ACTIVITY VERSUS CRIMINAL CONDUCT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio, (Mr. ASHBROOK) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it is a cherished tradition that in a free society citizens not only may protest but should protest to influence opinions and express opposition to governmental policies with which they do not agree. The war critics have every right to express their views. But when armed and organized to seize, destroy, and topple the elected authority, they are not exercising any "right" under the first amendment or any other amendment. They are engaging in guerilla warfare, which leads to disorder, chaos and ultimately, anarchy.

Consider the following line of thought: If burning and sacking a college building is a "political activity," then robbing a gas station is a "financial transaction" and rape is a "social contact." This is cartoonist Al Capp's view of the so-called politics of violence, and it makes sense, does it not? But, unfortunately, somewhere along the line, illegal activity by students or minority groups stopped being considered criminal conduct. We have the so-called liberal thinkers to thank for this.

Many people—who should know better—would excuse illegal and violent conduct by student mobs as an honest expression of political views or even as misdirected pranks. These are the same people who also believe we can travel the road to socialism, yet never get there; that we can spend out of all proportion to our income, yet maintain economic stability; and that we can tolerate a degree of campus disruption without violence and tragedy ensuing.

The tragic deaths at Kent State were indeed unfortunate, but they were not by any means surprising. It was entirely foreseeable that if hordes of students attacked a vastly outnumbered group of National Guardsmen with rocks, pipes, and bottles, at some point such violence risked a stronger response.

Militant radicals have, by their own admission, sought by every conceivable means precisely the type of violent confrontation that took place at Kent State, Ohio State, and so many other colleges around the Nation. They have made nonnegotiable demands, aroused passions, and goaded law enforcement officials, hoping for a violent confrontation. To our sorrow, they got it.

PRELUDE TO TRAGEDY

It would be amusing, if it were not so serious, to read references in the press to the serene pastoral atmosphere at Kent State prior to the recent tragedy on that campus. Actually, during the 1968–69 academic year, Kent State was the scene of four disturbances, two of which were violent, instigated by the Students for a Democratic Society—SDS.

The New York Times, for example, reported that "nothing much" had happened at Kent State since a 1958 panty raid. How inaccurate this article was is best indicated by a brief synopsis of the efforts made to radicalize the campus.

In 1968 and 1969, radicals continued an incessant barrage of violence-oriented hate propaganda on campus. Top SDS types like Mark Rudd, Carl Oglesby, and Bernardine Dohrn bombarded campus audiences. SDS rhetoric, to give specific examples, included an instance of an SDS leader urging followers to kill the cops.

The Kent State disruptions were the subject of investigation by the House Internal Security Committee on which I serve. During our hearings on SDS activities there, we were shown a copy of a document entitled "Organizers' Manual for the Spring Offensive" listing such non-negotiable demands as open admissions for what they called third world, black and white working-class people. Demands were to be pursued through a series of escalating actions described in the manual in this way:

> Beginning with guerrilla theater actions in dorms we can escalate to disrupting classes, street marches, quick assaults on buildings, etc., before moving to the major confrontation of the struggle.

Also during these Kent State hearings, testimony by school officials revealed that no more than 15 to 25 hard-core members of SDS out of an enrollment of more than 21,000 were responsible for the disruptions. This small number was supplied with films, pamphlets, newsletters, and directives by the Ohio regional SDS office in Cleveland, some 30 miles away.

In a column headed "There's Proof the SDS Planned to Destroy KSU," writer Victor Riesel blasts the myth that Kent was a bucolic school that suddenly and spontaneously went haywire. He recalls:

There are those of us who would hop off at Akron, drive the 10 miles and observe the SDS Weatherman faction—Mark Rudd, Bernardine Dohrn and comrades—scream, literally, for blood, for murder, for revolt, for the leveling of its buildings to wind-blown ashes, and for armed rebellion. For some time now Kent State U. has been the target for the SDS Ohio region and the Akron communes.

In July of 1969, in one of my weekly Washington reports to the residents of Ohio's 17th District, I warned:

The true face of the campus enemy is revealed in just two quotations from the radicals at Kent State. Both are from reports published by the student newspaper, *The Daily Kent Stater*.

First: An SDS spokeswoman [Joyce Cecora] called for armed rebellion on the Kent State campus, saying "Sitting on the grass in front of the administration building is not fighting—They used guns at Cornell, and they got what they wanted. It will come to that here!"

Second: Another speaker declared, "We'll start blowing up buildings, we'll start buying guns, we'll do anything to bring this (obscenity) school down."

As I have said before, the handwriting was on the wall for all of us to see who would look. When you have people of this type promoting violence, the violence and its tragic aftermath at Kent State are entirely predictable.

Columnist Riesel put it this way:

Blood, now rotting the earth of Kent's lovely campus, did not spill accidentally. That soil was tilled—furrowed by the clanging iron words of the toughest band of nihilists this land has known. Virtually all of them are outsiders. Virtually all of them chose Kent State because it is what it is, a source of strength for American forces, a source of learning for the children of working people, a spot in middle America.

Those who were surprised by the Kent State violence must be unaware of the inflammatory statements made by Jerry Rubin, currently on bail after having been convicted of crossing State lines to incite riots, in a speech to 1,500 students there shortly before the "spontaneous and unpredictable" uprising. Rubin said:

The first part of the Yippie program is kill your parents. I mean that quite seriously, because until you're prepared to kill your parents you're not really prepared to change the country, because our parents are our first oppressors.

In the last several years there has been a policy on campuses across the country to give students the opportunity to hear first hand a cross section of opinions and attitudes from visiting speakers, including Communists. The emphasis now on these same campuses is to feature members of the Chicago Seven, Black Panthers, and the like. The moderate, the responsible liberal or the conservative have difficulty finding a forum—or, if invited on campus, being given a chance to be heard. Colleges in Ohio, for example, have paid fees as high as $1,500 to hear the "establishment" blasted and profaned by black militants while offering patriotic speakers $50 and $100.

Unfortunately, the bitter seeds of discord sown by these barbaric agitators as they vent their spleens are costing the universities who invite them—or, uninvited, put up with them—much more than the speaking fee.

INNOCENT VICTIMS?

A great amount of my mail refers to the "innocent victims" at Kent State. While anyone can sympathize with the tragedy which resulted in the deaths of the four students, it just is not accurate to refer to "innocent" victims.

In the first place, all of those students confronting the National Guardsmen on that tragic day were there in violation of proper, legal orders against their congregation. On top of that, they were specifically and repeatedly ordered to disperse. Instead, under mob instincts they attacked the National Guardsmen with rocks and bottles.

Even if the four killed were not throwing bottles or hurling obscenities, they were associated in the mob that was acting in an illegal manner. They were acting in violation of law themselves. You might say they were foolish, unfortunate, or ill advised but you could not honestly say they were innocent. The innocent people were respecting the laws, remaining in their dormitories and not conducting an illegal and violent confrontation.

A good example of the "innocent" crowd was Miss Mary Ann Veccio, the so-called photo girl whose picture, crying out over one of the fallen students, appeared everywhere in the Nation. Without knowing the facts, most news service reports even referred to her as a coed. Some coed. She was a runaway who, by her own admission, was a part of a hippy group which went to Kent State because she heard "there was going to be an antiwar protest." The nonstudent radicals who gravitate to the storm centers throughout the United States are a major part of the campus problem. The "action" was at Kent State so that is where she went.

No, it is impossible to refer to any single one of those students and youths who congregated there that tragic day as innocent. Duped, stupid, foolish, unfortunate, cynical, dedicated revolutionary—one of these descriptive adjectives or a score of other ones might fit them individually but certainly not the word "innocent."

In our proper concern over the deaths at Kent State, we must not let emotionalism obscure the facts in the matter. Planned violence usually results in violence, but tragically sometimes also in unplanned violence and unexpected tragedy.

We would not, of course, equate the loss of lives with property damage and other costs of mindless violence, but at the same time we must remember that merchants and taxpayers pay dearly for the destruction wreaked by the "protesting" young barbarians.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer reported that the recent havoc at Kent State will run up a bill in excess of $1.25 million, a figure which does not include the "harsh economic blow to the city of Kent" or the heavy overtime bill for some 100 State highway patrolmen and costs for additional police in the communities surrounding Kent.

The cost of keeping more than 900 guardsmen for most of 7 days at Kent is estimated at $350,000. Another $150,000 is estimated as the cost of the window breaking and looting of stores in the city and the fires which destroyed the Army ROTC building and a storage barn on the campus. Room and board refunds to students, caused by ending the spring quarter at the halfway mark, are expected to amount to $750,000.

How much better that $1.25 million and the $2.2 million in damages due to campus disorders during the 1968–69 academic year could have been spent. And those whose barbaric illegal behavior results in these costs are the very ones who protest the loudest about our Government's spending priorities.

LIBERAL PERMISSIVENESS PAVED THE WAY

Unfortunately, over a long period of time, liberals have advocated the idea that the end justifies the means and have cultivated a permissiveness that allows each individual to decide for himself rather than yield to the law of the land. A more practical and hard-nosed approach is needed to enforce the law and protect innocent victims and mindless destruction of property.

Illegal conduct on campus must be met with the same response as illegal conduct elsewhere would bring. We should not have different classes of law enforcement for different classes of law violators. Society as a whole has a right to demand that laws are uniformly enforced. Activities which would be a felony if committed in the community at large are often overlooked or called "disorderly conduct" when committed on a college campus.

A large part of the problem lies in the type of administration we have in our universities. Many college administrations have allowed the radicals to achieve victory by permitting them to "call the shots." I do not know where administrations ever got the idea that they have to give an audience to shouting, cursing, unruly students. This idea of letting them have their way has been carried to an extreme where it is done on the terms of the militants rather than on the terms of the university.

What the militants fail to understand is that while the Constitution grants them freedom of speech—and even this right has been circumscribed to some extent through judicial construction—the Constitution does not require that anybody listen. The militants are confusing the right to advocate with what they view as also a right to get their own way. When they are heard but not heeded, they feel justified in resorting to violence.

Arson, bomb-throwing, assault and battery, the deliberate destruction of university equipment, and furniture, the looting of files and research notes, the forcible occupation of buildings, and the intimidation of students cannot be classified as exercise of the right of free speech.

Militancy no longer resorts to the soapbox—but increasingly to the tinderbox. The byword seems to be: mob action first, programs later.

It is naive indeed to think we are dealing merely with alienated students rather than purposeful radicals who are nihilistically oriented.

Having failed to persuade through four-letter rhetoric, the minority claims the right to impose its will by violence on the majority. And this is done in the name of reform, yet the radical militants are hard pressed to answer when they are asked what they would substitute for the status quo.

Rather than resulting in a mutual accommodation of interests, violence results instead in further provocation and escalation of violence and counterviolence. A free society has the moral right to protect itself through the legitimate use of force to preserve the rules. In the face of violent defiance, the law has no recourse but to pit force against force. Inevitably, there will be instances of overreaction.

Leveling the charge of "overreaction" has become the handmaiden, however, of almost every attempt by law enforcement officials to quell riots and other disorders. Had the National Guardsmen at Kent State failed to defend themselves, it is entirely conceivable that one or more of them might have been killed. But under the double standard espoused by the militant radicals, no one should shed any tears for dead guardsmen or, for that matter, for the many policemen who have been killed in the line of duty while protecting communities against rampaging mobs.

The Guardsmen were there because of the destruction and violence the student minority caused. It is standard tactics of the left to blame the police and the National Guardsmen. They are not to blame and should not bear the brunt of the fault which belongs elsewhere.

TACTICS OF MILITANT ORGANIZERS

Dr. Alex C. Sherriffs, professor of psychology at the University of California, Berkeley, recently presented a very incisive analysis of the similarities between the militant groups which have spearheaded the many episodes of violence on college campuses. As he correctly points out:

> They are alike in that they intend to seize power, or to destroy. They advance causes not to achieve them, but to produce conflict. They are, by and large, well organized and disciplined, and apparently have means of communication and travel superior to that of those they attack. Their pattern has been first to analyze friction points on individual campuses, then to seek out support in strategic places on the campuses and in the surrounding community. Certain faculty members, clergymen, sympathetic media people, and indigenous radicals or reflex liberals fill the bill. They push constantly, and they push for more than is possible. They wait for a mistake. As soon as it's even slightly credible, they invoke some greater "cause." The issue may have been visitation rights in girls rooms; it soon becomes an issue of freedom of assembly, or speech, or academic freedom. They simplistically paint the administrators and those of society who would support lawful processes as rigid, authoritarian, and out of step with the times. Usually, they set up the battle plan so they win either way: for example, if there is capitulation in relation to a sit-in, they control the building and move forward with new demands; if the administration holds firm and eventually calls for outside help, the militants contrive and then point to police brutality. They are willing to nibble, one issue at a time, because each success ensures a greater likelihood for the next success. This is a strategy of takeover. It is, in their own words, revolution.

Another excellent point Dr. Sherriffs makes in comparing the similarities of the coercive groups responsible for so much of the violence is that "they would never have held the stage if the majority were functioning, if the faculty were united and responsible, and if the administrators had wisdom and courage."

WHAT IS AHEAD

"The struggle has just begun" proclaims a handout distributed at American University in Washington, D.C., recently. The following two paragraphs give a brief idea of some of the plans being laid:

> We have taken over our campuses; we have the power to keep them. We must plan to occupy them and use them for our own purposes for the summer. At Princeton and other colleges, the administration has been forced to grant credit for the year without final exams; solidarity on your campus may win this too. If not, continue to occupy the school and allow exams and degrees to be given by permission of the students, under their administration, in rooms and at times designated by them.
>
> We must use the campus as a base for continuing the struggle through the summer: for closing down draft boards; educating the community; guarding beleaguered Panther headquarters; supporting workers' strikes; spreading the strike. Invite the community onto the university for which they have paid and make student housing available to young workers and blacks.

And at Purdue University in Lafayette, Ind., an instruction sheet was provided to student demonstrators telling them how to make the most effective use of Molotov cocktails, how to shut down the electric power, and how to disrupt the telephone system and radio communications. Instructions are also given on eluding police dogs, wrecking railroad trains, and introducing chemicals into university residence hall water supplies.

The story is the same at hundreds of colleges in all regions of our country. These are but samples of what the liberals would have us believe is legitimate political protest: blowing up trains and banks; closing down draft boards; making university policy; poisoning water supplies.

It is madness to label such activities "political protest." Can anyone doubt that is the work of deliberate anarchists? A tiny minority of dangerous criminals seek to overthrow the U.S. Government and all of its institutions.

What is desperately needed now is for the many well-meaning young people who have become the pawns of the criminal anarchists to be convinced that peaceful, responsible protest is effective. If the moderate students will disavow those who call for violent confrontation and work instead for peaceful persuasion within legal channels, then the radical elements would lose a potent force in their destructive efforts and be singled out as the criminal, unrepresentative minority they are.

CONCLUSIONS

Student dissent must be redirected to constructive channels so that it can remain true dissent rather than raucous, illegal and self-defeating conduct which results in arson, destruction of property, trampling the rights of others, and physical violence. Otherwise, the devastating sight of buildings blazing on campuses clouded by tear gas, of students taunting battle-ready troops and militia, and universities under seige or completely closed down will serve as a commonplace reminder of the consequences of "political activity" as defined and practiced by the campus radicals.

Those who excuse violence or illegal conduct as "pranks" are more guilty than any National Guardsman. Professors who sense the rebellion on campus but do not endeavor to direct it into proper channels are more culpable than the guardsmen, College presidents who capitulate to violence and nonnegotiable demands are far more to blame than the police or the guardsmen who must come to their campuses to fill the void created by their leadership vacuum. Political leaders who pander to minority groups and then turn their eyes away from riots and looting helped pull more triggers than any law enforcement official. Those who proclaim the right to violate the law as a "constitutional right" and call law and order "repression" or fascism fan the fires which lead to tragedy.

Do not blame the police or the National Guard for tragedies that occur. The root of the problem goes much deeper.

DISCRIMINATORY STATE UNIVERSITY ADMISSIONS POLICIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN), is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today called upon Attorney General John Mitchell to investigate Purdue University's admissions policies toward minority groups for possible discrimination and legal action under the Civil Rights Act of 1964. At the same time, I have introduced H.R. 17828, legislation to establish a Federal grant program to State universities which accept out-of-State students on a nondiscriminatory basis and H.R. 17840, legislation to extend the prohibition against Federal aid to public institutions which discriminate on the basis of religion or ancestry. Purdue University is a State university.

Many State universities are adopting restrictions on out-of-State students to cut down on the number of Jewish and other minorities at their schools. They decided that these out-of-State minorities were the cause of campus unrest and had to go.

Less than one-third of current State university restrictions on out-of-State enrollment existed prior to 1966. The rest, subsequently imposed, include quotas on the number of out-of-State students, higher levels of tuition and fees, and higher academic requirements.

The most blatantly discriminatory policies of any public university in the United States to my knowledge are those of Purdue. Purdue, which has an overall percentage limit on out-of-State students, places an additional limit on admissions from New York and New Jersey. These two States have the vast preponderance of potential Jewish, Black, Puerto Rican, and other minority students. In addition, Purdue sends letters discouraging applicants from those States. Purdue's intent is clear.

In the fall of 1969, Purdue attempted to cut back drastically on its student enrollment from the New York metropolitan area by specifically limiting admissions from that area to qualified children of Purdue alumni. While that policy was quickly abandoned, the current policy which replaced it, will nevertheless bring about a significant decrease in students attending Purdue from the region.

Before World War II many schools of higher education excluded Jewish students from universities by limiting enrollment from New York City.

More typical of the subtle form of discrimination imposed by the general quota is the practice of the University of Wisconsin. This school imposes an overall quota on out-of-State enrollment.

Giving in to pressure from State legislators and the chamber of commerce, the University of Wisconsin attempted to discourage enrollment from the 10 States, which together provided the University with a majority of its minority students, by giving priority to applicants from other States. While this policy was quickly rescinded as blatantly discriminatory, the adoption of a percentage quota on out-of-State enrollment has had the same impact. With respect to Jewish students, for example, enrollment as of the fall of 1969 was only one-third of what it has been at the same time in 1966.

While current Federal law prohibits discrimination by public institutions, a loophole in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not cut off Federal funding for such discrimination. I have introduced H.R. 17840 to close the loophole. And I have introduced H.R. 17828 to provide a positive incentive to State colleges and universities to adopt nondiscriminatory admission policies with respect to out-of-State students. The adoption of nativist admissions policies not only restricts educational opportunities of minority students, but insulates students attending State schools from outside forces.

I insert at this point in the RECORD my letter to Attorney General Mitchell, the texts of H.R. 17828 and H.R. 18240 and a study of admissions policies of State colleges and universities prepared by Harold Braverman of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 26, 1970.

Hon. JOHN MITCHELL,
Attorney General of the United States,
Justice Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL MITCHELL: The Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin, and empowers your Department to seek legal redress where such discrimination is uncovered.

A situation of apparent gross religious discrimination on the part of a public institution has come to my attention, which I would like to call your attention and request your Department to investigate for possible action.

Purdue University of West Lafayette, Indiana is a state supported school which imposes a quota on out-of-state admissions. This quota has been applied in a special manner to metropolitan areas of New York and New Jersey, areas with a large concentration of racial and religious minorities: Jewish, Blacks and Puerto Ricans. Applicants from the metropolitan area are required to be children of Purdue Alumni. This same standard is not in effect elsewhere. The result is a de facto limitation on enrollment of minority students.

Purdue recently modified its practice by eliminating the alumni requirement, but imposed in its place—for the residents of New York and New Jersey—a specific numerical limitation based on a ratio of those states' population to the population of the country as a whole, which was, like the previous restriction, not imposed upon any other states. The result is to continue in a more subtle manner to limit minority students, by placing a limit on the number of students from areas with the highest potential number of minority applicants.

I enclose for your information, some clippings and letters on this subject, and would be most pleased to cooperate with you further in contacting individuals and groups involved in this situation.

With relation to the above, I am introducing legislation tomorrow to amend Title 6 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. I would be interested in your Department's views on this legislation, a copy of which is also enclosed.

With kind regards, I am
Sincerely yours,
LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
Member of Congress.

H.R. 17828

A bill to amend Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to provide Federal assistance for the expansion of facilities for public colleges and universities which admit students from out of State on a nondiscriminatory basis

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title IV of the Higher Education Facilities Act is redesignated as title V, and sections 401 through 408 of such Act (and cross references thereto) are redesignated as sections 501 through 508, respectively.

SEC. 2. The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by inserting after title III thereof the following new title:

"TITLE IV—CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE FOR STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ADMITTING OUT-OF-STATE STUDENTS

"FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 401. The Congress hereby finds that (1) in order to afford every student the opportunity to secure a higher education it is necessary to secure additional facilities for our colleges and universities, (2) the demand for increased higher education facilities is not evenly distributed throughout the country since certain States have adopted a restrictive enrollment policy, (3) such a policy tends to restrict the growth of available facilities, provincialize the educational institutions of that State, and require even greater expansion of facilities by the other States, (4) such restrictions on out-of-State enrollment are producing a de facto discrimination against certain religious and racial groups. It is, therefore, the policy of the Congress to encourage the elimination of State residency requirements, or other practices which have the same effect, and establish a program of grants to public colleges and universities which practice open enrollment to assist them in expanding their facilities in order that everyone will have an opportunity to secure a higher education.

"APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 402. (a) The Commissioner shall carry out a program of grants to public colleges and universities for the expansion of academic facilities to accommodate more students in accordance with this title.

"(b) For the purpose of making grants under this title, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $200,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and $300,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973.

"(c) Sums appropriated under subsection (b) shall remain for obligation until the close of the fiscal year next succeeding the fiscal year for which they were appropriated.

"ALLOTMENTS TO INSTITUTIONS

"SEC. 403. (a) From the sums appropriated under section 402 for a fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot to each public college and university an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount being allotted as the number of out-of-State students admitted to the institution for full-time study at the undergraduate level during the preceding fiscal year bears to the number of such students so admitted to all public colleges and universities in the United States during such fiscal year.

"(b) If the Commissioner determines that any amount allotted to a college or university under subsection (a) for a fiscal year is not needed by that institution it shall be reallotted by the Commissioner, on the basis of such factors as he determines to be equitable and reasonable among the other public colleges and universities which, as determined by the Commissioner, are able to use without delay any amounts so reallotted for the purposes of this title. Amounts reallotted under this subsection shall remain available until the close of the fiscal year next succeeding the fiscal year for which they were originally allotted.

"GRANTS

"SEC. 404. The Commissioner, on the basis of applications received by him, shall make grants to public colleges and universities upon receipt of assurances satisfactory to him that the grant will be used for the expansion of academic facilities to accommodate additional students, and that the college or university will comply with such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement and accounting for Federal funds paid to the college or university, and that it will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this title.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 405. For purposes of this title—

"(1) The term 'public college and university' means an institution of higher education which (A) grants a baccalaureate degree or its equivalent, (B) is under public supervision and control, (C) admits out-of-State students without discrimination in requirements for admission or in the amounts of tuition and fees charged, and without limitations on the number of such students to be admitted.

"(2) The term 'out-of-State student' means a student whose principal place of residence is outside the State in which the public college or university is located."

H.R. 17840

A bill to amend title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to bar discrimination based on religion or ancestry in programs administered by institutions of higher education which are under public supervision and control and which receive Federal assistance.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d) is amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 601." and by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) No person in the United States shall on the ground of religion or ancestry be excluded from participation in, be denied benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under, any program or activity administered by an institution of higher education which is under public supervision and control and which receives Federal financal assistance."

ADMISSIONS POLICIES OF STATE UNIVERSITIES

(By Harold Braverman)

In 1969, two state universities took steps to curtail the admission of out-of-state residents. In preceding years, other state universities and state legislatures had mandated cuts in the enrollment of students from out-of-state, but none of these provoked the same concern in the Jewish community as did the two cases last year.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

The first case involved the University of Wisconsin, an institution which had traditionally accepted large numbers of non-resident students, many of them Jewish young people from the eastern part of the United States. In 1966, apparently yielding to pressures from within the Wisconsin state legislature, the university administration adopted a policy that applications for admission from students living in 10 particular states would be "held" until all other applications from Wisconsin and the other 39 states had been processed. Whatever the purpose of the "hold" policy, the fact was that some of the 10 states singled out for this unfavorable treatment were states which would, in the absence of such a restrictive policy, furnish the University of Wisconsin with virtually all its Jewish and Black out-of-state students.

As a result of a protest by the university's faculty, this policy was dropped. However, legislative pressure continued. It has been reported both in the press of Wisconsin and by a leader of the Wisconsin legislature that much of this pressure was generated by lawmakers who were seeking ways to reduce the number of Jewish students on the university campus.

In March, 1969 the Board of Regents of the university adopted a policy which appeared to respond to legislative pressure. This policy stated that no more than 25% of the university's freshman class entering in September, 1969 could be composed of non-residents of Wisconsin; no more than 20% of the freshman class entering in 1970; and no more than 15% entering in 1971.

The Anti-Defamation League's investigation reveals that the new restriction has already had a drastic impact upon Jewish students. The number of Jewish freshmen who enrolled at the University of Wisconsin in September, 1969 was less than one-fourth the number who enrolled in the academic year 1966–67.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY

The second 1969 case which concerned the Jewish community was that of Purdue University, a state institution in Indiana. Purdue University, responding ostensibly to demands that Indiana residents be favored over out-of-state students, decided to cut the admission of non-Indianans. However, Purdue went a step further than did the University of Wisconsin. Purdue decided to limit particularly the admission of students from the metropolitan New York area, requiring that such students be especially well qualified, and that they also be children of Purdue alumni. Obviously, such a policy, aimed at a major Jewish population center, imposed special disabilities upon Jewish students interested in studying at Purdue. Subsequently, Purdue modified this policy somewhat. The university decided that, beginning in 1970, it would admit students from New York and New Jersey on a quota basis rooted in the proportion of the populations of New York and New Jersey to the total population of the United States. But the change continued, in substance, to favor non-Indianans from 47 states over residents of New York and New Jersey.

ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE STUDY

In the light of these developments, the Anti-Defamation League undertook a study in late 1969 to determine the extent to which state universities limit the admission of out-of-state students and how such limitations might affect opportunities for Jewish youth.

ADL's survey sought to determine whether the universities had percentage restrictions on out-of-state students; whether there were any restrictions directed against specific geographical area; and whether any proposals were under consideration for further restrictions. The institutions surveyed were the 136 degree-granting universities under state control listed in the 1968 edition of *American Universities and Colleges,* published by the American Council on Education.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

(1) Of the 136 state universities, 88—or 65%—do not at this time impose a percentage or a geographical restriction against students from out-of-state.

(2) However, of these 88, there are 15 which are expected to institute restrictions.

(3) Of the 136 state universities, only one uses geographical differentiation in selecting students from out-of-state. That institution is Purdue Univeristy in Indiana which has assigned a quota to students from New York and New Jersey rooted in the proportion of the populations of these two states to the national population. Such a policy obviously disfavors students from New York and New Jersey as against students residing in the other 47 states. And, because New York and New Jersey constitute a major Jewish population center of the United States, this policy is a serious obstacle to the admission of Jewish students to Purdue.

(4) Of the 136 state universities, 48—or 35%—have percentage restrictions against out-of-state students. These percentages range from a low of 5% for the University of Massachusetts to a high of 40% for the University of Vermont. The mean group consists of 22 state universities which restrict out-of-state students to 20% of the freshman class.

(5) Without fixing formal percentage restrictions, a number of state universities use devices which have a restrictive effect:

A. One such device is to charge out-of-state students substantially more than resident students for tuition.

B. More significant is the requirement that out-of-state students have much better entrance credentials than residents. Thus, the University of California requires that Californians have a secondary school average of 3.1 to qualify for admission. However, non-residents must present an average of 3.5. Consequently, although the University of California fixes no percentage quota for non-residents, the reality is that the percentage of out-of-state students admitted there is usually about 10%. *Of the 136 institutions, at least 25 specifically demand higher qualifications of out-of-state students without the imposition of a percentage quota.*

If these 25 are added to the 48 universities which use a percentage restriction, we arrive at a total of 73—or more than one-half of the total group—that restrict the admission of non-residents to their campuses.

(6) If we limit our attention to the 48 campuses in our survey group that now have *percentage* restrictions against out-of-state students, we note that 30 of them have instituted these restrictions since 1966.

It is apparent, then, that a trend has begun among state universities to limit the admission of non-resident students. Considering today's uncertain economy, and the reluctance of state legislatures to impose additional taxes, it would appear that this trend will continue in the years to come.

(7) The following are actions taken since 1966 by state universities and/or state legislatures designed to restrict the admission of students from out-of-state, and actions that are anticipated in the near future:

(a) *Florida.*—At present, one of the 5 Florida state universities—Florida State—has a percentage restriction against out-of-state students. This quota is between 12% and 15%. However, it is expected that the other 4 institutions, including the University of Florida which now has an enrollment of 2,500 Jewish students, will soon impose restrictions.

(b) *Indiana.*—In 1969, Purdue University instituted a 25% restriction on out-of-state students and qualified this further for the states of New York and New Jersey with a quota for students from these states based upon the proportion of the populations of New York and New Jersey to the total national population.

(c) *Kansas.*—Although Kansas State, the University of Kansas and Wichita State have no formal percentage quotas for out-of-state students, they have adopted a policy that if applications from non-residents are "too heavy," they will not be admitted.

(d) *Kentucky.*—In 1968, the state legislature passed a law which was approved by the governor, setting a limit of 20% of non-residents admitted to the 5 state university campuses.

(e) *Michigan.*—In 1968, the Michigan state legislature mandated a restriction of 20% for out-of-state students admitted to all 9 state university campuses. These campuses include the University of Michigan which has traditionally attracted large numbers of Jewish students from out-of-state.

(f) *Ohio.*—In 1966, the State Board of Regents of the state university system recommended that each campus restrict out-of-state students to 20%. In 1969, the Ohio state legislature mandated significantly higher state aid for resident students than for non-resident students. Of the 10 state university campuses, 5 have already instituted a 20% restriction. Although the other 5 have "no restrictions," the fact is that they admit far less than 20% from out-of-state. For example, Cleveland State University has no out-of-state students on its campus.

(g) *Pennsylvania.*—Pennsylvania State, which has traditionally attracted many Jewish students from out-of-state, has a 10% quota for non-residents. In addition, political experts predict that the Pennsylvania state legislature will soon ask all 4 state universities to favor Pennsylvania residents over non-residents.

(h) *Tennessee.*—Of the 7 state university campuses in Tennessee, 5 instituted a 15% quota on students from out-of-state beginning in 1969.

(i) *Wisconsin.*—1. The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin, responding to legislative pressure, instituted a 25% quota for out-of-state students in 1969, with this quota to be reduced to 20% in 1970 and 15% in 1971.

2. One year earlier, in 1968, the other 2 state university campuses—Stout State and

Wisconsin State—instituted a 25% quota for out-of-state students and also demanded higher fees and academic credentials from such students.

IMPLICATIONS FOR JEWISH STUDENTS

It is estimated that there are 380,000 Jewish undergraduates studying on American campuses. It is further estimated that of this number, 243,000—or 70% of the total Jewish undergraduate population—are clustered in 83 of the more than 500 campuses each of which has a Jewish student population of at least 25.

Of these 83 institutions, 31 are state universities and, therefore, the subject of particular concern in this study.

The estimated number of Jewish students at these 31 state universities is 91,000—or 24% of all Jewish college and university undergraduate students. Thus, the admissions policies of these 31 state universities are especially relevant to this study. If they restrict, or contemplate restriction of, students from outside their own states, this can have a limiting effect upon the educational opportunities of Jewish youth.

Of these 31 state universities, 13 already have percentage quotas on the number of students that they will admit from out-of-state. Among these 13 are two New England state univerities—the University of Connecticut and the University of Massachusetts—which are the most restrictive of the 31 institutions. The University of Massachusetts has a maximum of 5% for non-resident students (the lowest in the nation), while the University of Connecticut has a quota of from 8% to 10%.

In short, 13—or 40%—of the 31 state universities that have large Jewish student populations, use percentage restrictions against out-of-state students. If we add to this 8 state universities which require especially high qualifications of non-residents, there are then 21 of the 31 state universities—campuses which over the years have attracted large numbers of Jewish students—whose policies are restrictive against students from without their states. And if we then add 6 state universities which, we are advised, are contemplating restrictions against out-of-state students, we reach a total of 27 out of the 31—or 85% of the 31 state universities that have traditionally attracted meaningful number of Jewish students—which restrict or will soon restrict.

THE FISCAL PICTURE

The burgeoning interest among American youth in getting a college education has created serious financial problems for colleges and universities. Privately controlled institutions of higher learning have tried to meet this problem in some measure by increasing tuition fees; today, tuition fees of $3,000 a year or more are not uncommon in the private university sector. Withal, it is said that even such high tuition fees do not approach the cost to the institution of teaching the students. Therefore, deficits must be made up by using capital and by aggressive fund raising.

The problem for the state university—dependent as it is on public money allocated by the state government—is even more critical. The state university cannot engage in public fund raising and has no capital assets at its disposal. Thus, confronted with the same problem as the private university—i.e., the fact that tuition fees cannot cover costs—it has but one recourse. It must turn to the state legislature for money.

State legislatures are reluctant to accept the political onus of imposing more taxes to pay for state functions. Therefore, they look for other devices with which to meet the problem. In addition to raising tuition fees for students of their own state, a number of legislatures and Boards of Regents of state university systems have instituted special tuition fees for students from out-of-state, in a number of cases twice as high as the fees paid by the residents.

Despite such measures, the cost of educating a student still cannot be approached by tuition fees alone. Increasingly, large state subsidies are required to continue the operation of the state universities. Consequently, there has arisen pressure from the public, and in the legislatures, to reduce the number of students from out-of-state who are admitted to the universities so that the public money allocated to these institutions will be used primarily or exclusively for students who are bona fide residents of the state.

A RETROGRESSIVE TREND

All the foregoing suggests that there is an increasing trend on the part of state universities to make it more difficult for non-residents to study on their campuses, and that this may cause increasing limitations on the opportunities of Jewish students. Underlying the pressures of the state universities to restrict the admission of non-residents is undoubtedly a kind of xenophobia or nativism which has been exacerbated by recent student unrest on some campuses. A clamor is heard that campus disruption is usually led by student activists from other states. The easy solution is then found—reduce the number of non-residents admitted to the state university. Never is it acknowledged by legislatures or by Boards of Regents that the intent of the restriction is to cut down the enrollment of Jewish students. But the effect can be exactly that, as in the case of the University of Wisconsin.

Without a proven intent to discriminate on racial or religious grounds, we are confronted with an almost immutable fact of the American system—namely, that each state controls its own university system and that, absent evidence that a state university discriminates on grounds of race or religion, such a university may be invulnerable to legal attacks if it chooses even to bar non-residents completely from its campus.

Invulnerable in terms of legal attacks, but certainly vulnerable to the charge that it is retrogressing in terms of its educational purpose. If state universities continue the restrictive trend that has begun, provincialism and insularism will be the rule, not the exception. Diffusion of students will be arrested. The Wisconsin student will encounter almost only Wisconsinians on his campus, and the California youth will see fewer and fewer Mid-Westerners, Southerners and Easterners at the University of California.

Such a trend may invite retaliation. For example, as students from New York encounter more difficulty in gaining admission to, let us say, the University of Wisconsin, the University of Michigan and Pennsylvania State, they will apply in increasing numbers to the State University of New York. How long will it be then, before the State University of New York abandons its present liberal policy of no restrictions against out-of-state students, and fixes a quota for non-residents?

The finger of blame for this trend may be pointed also at some state universities in the Northeast, the area of greatest Jewish population concentration, for helping, perhaps unwittingly, the rationale of the movement toward restriction. When the University of Massachusetts and the University of Connecticut have for many years applied five percent and eight percent quotas, respectively, to non-residents, it may appear to come with ill grace to raise questions about other state universities in the Midwest and the South that are today fixing quotas of fifteen percent to twenty five percent, declaredly in the name of increasing educational opportunities for their own residents.

Perhaps then what is called for is an appraisal by the state universities of their obligations not only to their own residents but to the rest of the American people, and to their educational goals—an appraisal which should take into serious account the damage done to students and to universities by increasing provincialism—an appraisal in which the federal government ought to participate since the state universities exist in large measure by virtue of federal grants.

MISTER SPEAKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, always there is regret and sadness at the announcement of a great friend and American that he or she is retiring. This is natural, for there is an inexplicable reluctance to accept what one knows will happen sooner or later. In the case of our great friend and leader, Speaker McCORMACK, this is especially so. How reluctant one is to give up the tried and the true.

There is one compensating factor, however, and that is the secure knowledge that the Speaker has written by action the precepts and examples we can follow. Speaking as a Member, a relative newcomer, I take this opportunity to join others who have rendered tribute to this great American and humanitarian.

And, further, I take pride in introducing into the RECORD at this point an editorial appearing in my hometown of San Antonio's daily, the San Antonio Light:

[From the San Antonio, Tex., Light, May 23, 1970]

MISTER SPEAKER

The long record of accomplishment of John J. McCormack needs no defense. It is, in fact, much too long to be reiterated here.

He had great influence in all the innovative social legislation of the New Deal, the Fair Deal, the New Frontier and the Great Society.

His allegiance to the office of the presidency is legendary; but this never kept him from asserting personal leadership contrary to a particular president's views when he felt he was right.

Mr. McCormack, to be sure, will continue pushing for progressive legislation until his term expires at the end of the year.

We wish him a restful but not inactive retirement. The wisdom of four decades of legislative commitment and leadership will be of invaluable help to the new generation of legislators who may seek his counsel.

RIGHT TO WORK A DEFINITE ISSUE IN POSTAL REFORM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I was most interested in reading in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, May 22, 1970, beginning at page 16814 the remarks of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) regarding "Right to Work" as an issue in the currently pending postal reform bill.

The gentleman from Arizona and I have served together on the House Post

Office and Civil Service Committee ever since his election to the House and as he knows, I have a very high personal regard for him and a great deal of respect for his opinions.

In this instance, however, in saying, as he does, "Let me say here and now that 'right to work' is not an issue in postal reform. The bill reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service neither advances nor retards the 'right to work' movement; it leaves it precisely where it is now. It retains the status quo." My colleague is completely in error.

We are not dealing in the postal reform bill with employment in the private sector. I agree that the postal reform bill does not alter the Taft-Hartley Act. But what it does is to extend the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act for the very first time to Federal employment.

The status quo of Federal employment is that there is absolutely no way, under existing law, for union officials and Federal management executives to negotiate or otherwise bring into existence a union shop in the Federal service.

To spell it out even more plainly under the presently existing law, there can be no union shop or agency shop where Federal employees are concerned.

Under the provisions of H.R. 17070 as reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, for the first time, the issue of a union shop or agency shop would be subject to negotiation. Likewise it would be an issue subject to binding arbitration.

While it is true that section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act which prohibits the negotiation of union shops in States having right-to-work laws, is incorporated into H.R. 17070 with the other provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, there are at least some States whose right-to-work laws are so worded that they would be inapplicable to this situation.

Then, of course, there are the Federal employees outside the 17 right-to-work States who now have the protection of Executive Order 11491. Section 1(a) of that order states:

> Each employee has the right, freely and without fear of penalty or reprisal, to form, join and assist a labor organization or to refrain from any such activity, and each employee shall be protected in the exercise of this right.

It is not my purpose to defend the National Right-To-Work Committee or its executive vice president, Mr. Reed Larson.

Neither do I have any opinion or any basis for an opinion as to whether his vote on the right-to-work amendment was a factor in the defeat of our good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska in a primary.

I am confident that Mr. Larson, the Right-To-Work Committee and our colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska are quite capable of defending themselves.

But I must take issue with my colleague when he suggests that H.R. 17070 does not change the status quo with regard to the right-to-work issue.

I am completely confident that he will agree with me when I say that for the first time in the history of the Federal service, if H.R. 17070 in its present form becomes law, a union shop can be negotiated—or put into effect through binding arbitration—with the result that a man working for the postal service can be required to pay union dues or lose his job.

This certainly is not the status quo.

THE BMT VERSUS THE SST

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, in the shadow of last week's fatal crash on New York City's IND subway, this Congress is today considering the Department of Transportation appropriations bill for the coming fiscal year. Contained in this bill is a $290 million appropriation for the next phase of the civil supersonic transport plane—the SST. In the same bill an upper limit for funds for the urban mass transit system is under discussion. This ceiling totals only $214 million. There is a good chance that the actual appropriation will fall far below the established ceiling. We cannot let such misplaced priorities go unchallenged.

To those who have never ridden the New York City subway during rush hour—to them I say you are missing something you would never forget. To those who have—I offer my condolences.

Each day millions of citizens in New York and in other major cities board this Nation's inadequate mass transit systems. These people must ride the subway to get to their place of work. At the same time, they have to fight the crowds, endure the delays, breakdowns, heat, and dirt—not to mention the increased cost—which have become facts of life on mass transit systems.

Thus today we have two provisions up for discussion within the same appropriations bill—money for the SST and money for mass transit.

My opposition to a supersonic transport plane is of a longstanding nature. On the floor of the House in February 1969, I expressed my strong disapproval. Today, I will again add my voice and my vote to those of my colleagues in this House opposing the building of this aircraft.

At this time there has yet to be a successful attempt to solve the sonic boom and the noise problem that comes with the SST. We have been told that the sideline noise of this aircraft would be "like 50 regular jets taking off simultaneously."

As a sponsor, and an active supporter of legislation that would substantially decrease the amount of noise pollution, I cannot support the development of a new aircraft that would pose actual danger—in terms of noise level—to the health of our community.

While viewing the Concorde, the French equivalent of the American SST, I had occasion to observe that the noise from that aircraft actually destroyed the roof of a barn that was in its flight path.

Some say that the SST will not fly over populated areas. If this is in fact the case, then I hold that the airplane is not a sound Government investment. The percentage of people who would actually make use of the SST to fly transoceanic flights is small as compared to the millions who use the mass transit systems daily. If Government money is to be expended let it be spent to benefit the millions and not the few. It is high time that our country's priorities be oriented to benefit the masses.

Others argue that we must develop the SST because other nations are likely to develop their own in the near future. I find this argument very unconvincing.

Finally, let us take a long and searching look at the cost of the supersonic transport plane. A total of $708 million has already been expended. In the last 6 months alone, there has been a cost overrun of $76 million above what was originally projected. Individuals have said that the plane will cost in the billions before it is completed.

I say that we have already spent too much time, effort, and money. To the cost overrun, the costs in environmental damage, add the social costs—the costs to citizens in such areas as mass urban transit where this money is urgently needed and we see the SST has been too expensive for us to continue on our present course.

KENT STATE INCIDENT

(Mr. DEVINE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, since there appears to be so much twisted, unbalanced and biased reporting on the tragedy at Kent State University early this month, I think it is well to publish the views of Garry W. Jackson, a journalism and political science major at Weber State College, Ogden, Utah, which are set forth below:

THE KENT STATE VILLAINS: A VIEW NEGLECTED BY THE NEWS MEDIA

(By Garry W. Jackson)

(A journalism and political science student at Weber State College, Ogden, Utah, tells who was wrong in the Kent State killings. He believes his view is the majority sentiment of the nation's young people.)

The tragic events of Monday, May 4th, 1970, at Kent State University near Akron, Ohio, involving the deaths of four young students have caused a great deal of anguish and much soul-searching among the violence-ridden American people.

I don't think the blame can be singled out to any one individual such as President Nixon, Ohio Governor James A. Rhodes, or the commander of the Ohio National Guard, Adjutant General S. D. DelCorso. I do not think the men who fired the shots can be held truly accountable, nor do I think the students should shoulder all the blame. It is extremely difficult to stand up and say that any one person or element is to blame, and yet my very soul balks at the prospect of just chalking this up as another one of those unfortunate incidents. I have the most profound sympathy for the unfortunate families who must bear this tragedy. Nevertheless, I sense an obligation to set down in words what this tragedy has shown me and—I feel certain—thousands of other students who must surely be just as bewildered as I am.

In the first place. I am appalled at the media's incredibly shoddy coverage of this

event. For example, was it necessary for CBS News to subject this already tormented nation to the pathetic figure of the father of one of the deceased students—a man totally shattered by grief—and to allow or perhaps even encourage this poor man, in what was perhaps the saddest moment of his life, to make a statement that clearly revealed animosity toward President Nixon? We can sympathize with this man considering his frame of mind. One can only surmise the depths of the President's sorrow and dismay as a result of the deplorable actions of this once-respected network.

I cannot forgive CBS News for capitalizing on the grief and misfortune of others to make some political "harpoon" to attack a President who has had the courage to take an action he felt was necessary to save American lives in Vietnam, regardless of political considerations.

The President is obviously suffering from all of this. He has said that he regrets the use of the word "bums" in referring to some campus demonstrators. I wish I could say the same of my fellow students, but I can't. The fact of the matter is that there are "bums" on our campuses, there are "effete snobs" on our campuses, and there is an "unelected elite" in our news media. Two years ago I wouldn't have believed it. The sad truth is that we, as students, know exactly who the "bums" and "effete snobs" are and we haven't taken a stand against them. Every time that an elected official singles out a militant minority bent on destruction for his most "colorful" epithets, which in all probability they deserve, we launch into some massive tantrum as if we had been personally assaulted. For months after the Vice President's famous speech, kids who had nothing whatever in common with a truly "effete snob" were running around campuses with quaint little "I'm an effete snob" badges. It must really be a hollow experience for a policeman or a National Guardsman to read in a newspaper that the Vice President or other officials will be prohibited from using "abrasive" language in referring to dissenting students. I hereby submit a proposal that use of the word "pig" in referring to policemen, presidents, or National Guardsmen be prohibited by student proclamation.

The fact is my generation is just not qualified to conduct any kind of "revolution." I have struggled for the last two years in vain attempts to find out just what the "revolution" is all about. The truth is there is no revolution. There is only a chaotic force of individuals and groups advocating abstract ideals, i.e.—peace, freedom, love—all without the slightest comprehension of what these things actually mean. Advocating peace with firebombs, Molotov cocktails, and bricks; advocating freedom while enjoying the maximum freedom they can possibly be allowed without anarchy; advocating love while hurling vulgar obscenities of hatred at anyone who opposes peace on their terms is only alienating them from the masses they propose to lead.

Students are going to have to realize that yes, America is receptive to change, more so than any other nation. But it must be the will of the people. It is a most base form of hypocrisy that the militants say "power to the people!" when the sum total of their support numbers some 2% of a total of 202 million people. Trying to force a revolution with these figures is madness. Those who are of the opinion that there must be a violent, convulsive revolution along Bolshevik lines in America are advocating sheer lunacy and shouldn't pretend to be shocked and amazed at the first sign of bloodshed. The point is that in our own supercilious hypocrisy we have imagined that we are a special or chosen generation, a force destined to "liberate" the world from war, poverty, racism, etc. We have paid "lip service" to the word revolution, and have conjured up many romantic "myths" about the moral necessity for it. But, is what happened at Kent University what we want? I don't think so.

Perhaps a special investigation will be launched and the net findings will be that the "system" is such that it provoked the extreme reactions which resulted in the four deaths at Kent University. If this should be the case, then the real villain will once again have escaped unscathed.

Who are the real villains behind this tragedy?

They are those who have taught us how to "rationalize" violence; those who have fired us with the infamous precept that violence is justified in order to bring about desired reform; those who have presented the entirely false imagery of a "police-state" America bent on repression; those who have vilified and ridiculed our national leaders from the immunity of the nation's colleges and universities, from the privileged sanctuaries of TV newsrooms, and even from the hallowed halls of the U.S. Senate; those who propose to substitute anarchy for government by law; and finally, we, the students, must share in the villainy of this tragedy, for we have failed to take a strong stand against those who wish to effect change through violence.

Anyone who thinks these are the vitriolic musings of a radical right-winger or Neo-Nazi should take particular note. These villains, these "bums," these "effete snobs" do exist, and four students are dead as a result of their vile exhortations. Will we continue to "cover" for them? Where, my fellow students, in the name of reason do we go from here?**

ORDERLY CONTROLS OF TEXTILE, APPAREL AND FOOTWEAR IMPORTS

(Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join with my three Republican colleagues from the State of North Carolina to reintroduce a bill providing for orderly controls of textile, apparel, and footwear imports. Mr. JONAS, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. RUTH, and I have previously sponsored this legislation, first introduced in April by Congressman MILLS, and we are pleased to offer it today along with 35 cosponsors. This brings to 245 the total of House Members who have sponsored this legislation—well over the number required for a majority.

We have become increasingly concerned about the damage caused by foreign imports to these three major industries and feel it is urgent to provide reasonable and orderly controls to restore fair competition in the domestic market. More than a year of determined efforts by the White House and top administration officials to achieve voluntary agreements with countries such as Japan have not met with success. This bill offers the incentives for negotiations which are now lacking and in fact emphasizes negotiated voluntary agreements for controlling imports.

Experience has shown that we must now have a legislative means to assure that controls will be imposed if negotiations fail. This bill provides that import limitations would apply only to countries which failed to negotiate voluntary agreements with us.

It is not the intention of this bill to build high tariff walls around the American market. We are not proposing fixed and inflexible quotas on imports. However, we must have some reasonable means to assure that nations which have low-wage policies will not be able to take unfair advantage of our domestic producers. These three great industries offer community support as well as employment for hundreds of thousands of Americans. The growing challenge of imports for our own State shows we must not sit idly by and watch these sources of employment be destroyed.

We are gratified by the wave of bipartisan support for this bill coming from every section of the country, and we are particularly pleased that if this legislation were brought to a vote in the House of Representatives today, it would be passed on the basis of its joint sponsors alone.

The Ways and Means Committee is now considering trade policy legislation. It is our hope that the provisions of H.R. 16920, the Mills bill, will be included in the measure reported out so that the Members of the House can indicate their support of this plan to solve the urgent problems that have arisen for these industries.

IT IS TIME FOR ACTION ON THE ECONOMY

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing a most unusual period of economic unrest. The American economy is sound by any standards. Nevertheless, there is uncertainty which has produced all the appearance of a recession. Unless confidence is restored, it is entirely possible that the country soon will find itself in a depression.

The President has attempted to provide a businesslike administration, but the country is worried. The constant agitation about the war, the unrest on the campuses, the continued price and wage inflation, and the increase in unemployment all have added to the uncertainty. Before the gloom deepens and we actually find ourselves in a depression, it is very important that the President exercise strong leadership to restore confidence. The time is now. Conferences with business and labor leaders and economists should be held forthwith to discuss ways and means of coping with continued inflation and unemployment. I am glad to note that one such meeting with business leaders has been called, but the matter cannot stop there.

These meetings alone will not solve the problem, but they are needed to clear the air and to focus public attention on the facts underlying present economic trends. They can help to indicate the proper direction of a course of action to restore stability. Perhaps the administration has been too complacent in dealing with the problem areas. Statements by administration spokesmen that the

economy is all right and that an upturn is soon to be anticipated are too reminiscent of the psychology of the Hoover administration, which many people remember. The President needs to take the country more into his confidence by explaining the Nation's problems, clarifying his policies and outlining his proposals for correcting the difficulties. In other words, it is a time for stronger leadership than we have witnessed. The economy has been drifting and if this is allowed to continue, we can soon find ourselves in dangerous waters.

THE LORTON HOLOCAUST

(Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, extensive public hearings earlier this year pointed up the mismanagement of the District of Columbia Department of Corrections, but the payoff came last weekend at the Lorton complex, which looks now like Berlin after a fire-bombing.

But fire and destruction is only half the story. The riot began about 9:30, but the Fairfax County volunteer fire departments were not even called for two and a half hours. When they arrived at midnight fully equipped to stop the holocaust, they had to wait for the civil defense units from Washington who contrary to standing orders governing riot calls at Lorton, had not even been called.

Another $1 million went up in smoke. But the point is not even the amount of damage at Lorton, but that in searching for a scapegoat, Mr. John O. Boone, who is supposed to run Lorton, does not blame the prisoners, does not question the politics of the Department of Corrections; does not even question his own actions or motives in delaying calls for help. He blames the Fairfax County firemen for the whole thing.

Going into Lorton in daylight is dangerous; going in darkness in the middle of a riot is suicidal; but the volunteer firemen were willing to go—if only they could be guaranteed their safety from rampaging inmates while fighting the fires. I salute these brave men, unpaid, unheralded, and unafraid, and I rise to defend them.

They did not cause the Lorton riot—or linger outside enjoying the blaze. We must ask Mr. John Boone if he knows where the blame really lies—what he was doing for 3 hours after the fun and games started, trying to reason with rampaging inmates, or just hoping to hide another Lorton disaster from the public.

The Fairfax County firemen were not surprised to be called to Lorton. They have been there several times before. But they were surprised and deeply hurt at being blamed for letting Lorton burn, when Mr. Boone surely knows their contingency plan for riot situations requires police protection for firemen. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how anxious these good men will be next time they are routed from their beds in the middle of the night with a call to Lorton?

Mr. Speaker, in behalf of every member of the Fairfax County firefighting system, I demand an apology from Mr. Boone. They deserve no less.

COLUMBIA LAW SCHOOL ALUMNI ASSOCIATION'S MEDAL FOR EXCELLENCE AWARDED TO DISTRICT ATTORNEY FRANK S. HOGAN

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 23, 1970, Frank S. Hogan, district attorney of New York County, was awarded the Columbia Law School Alumni Association's Medal of Excellence. As alumni and friends of Columbia Law School will attest, this honor was a well deserved tribute to an alumnus who has made monumental contributions to law enforcement and to his alma mater.

For three decades Frank S. Hogan has served as district attorney of New York County. He is recognized everywhere as "Mr. District Attorney," and his office is the model which conscientious prosecutors have strived to emulate.

The qualities of integrity, public spiritedness, modesty, and charm possessed by Frank Hogan are legendary. A rare public servant to whom New Yorkers are deeply indebted, he has imbued his office with his own sense of justice, making it the most respected district attorney's office in the Nation.

I am pleased to add my own congratulations to District Attorney Hogan on the occasion of this honor and include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the citation which accompanied the Medal of Excellence presented to him:

CITATION TO FRANK S. HOGAN

Resolute personal and public integrity, steadfast devotion to the highest standards of the bar, and great compassion for his fellow man characterize Frank Smithwick Hogan. To our loyal alumnus we award the Medal for Excellence to reflect the abundant affection and respect for him which we share with the City he has served so faithfully and well.

The son of a grocer in Waterbury, Connecticut, the young Frank Hogan held a variety of jobs, some quite colorful in retrospect, eventually putting himself through Columbia College and Law School. After graduation, he struggled for a time as a private practitioner until the day in 1935 when he made the move which was to determine his professional life and give New Yorkers a public servant of such extraordinary value and such exceptional quality that he and his office were to become a national model. He signed on with a promising young man then newly appointed to head a special rackets investigation and became one of his small band of lawyers. That man, another Columbian and previous recipient of the Medal for Excellence, was Thomas E. Dewey, to whom with characteristic modesty Frank Hogan still accords full credit for creating the Office of District Attorney in New York as a non-political, full-time professional office, committed aggressively and exclusively to the public interest. In 1941, Frank Hogan took the reins from his admired predecessor and his uninterrupted captaincy of the office began.

As "Mr. District Attorney" for almost three decades, Frank Hogan has scrupulously preserved the original design of the office adding his own unique contribution, and has trained generations of assistants in the stern responsibilities of public trust, the perseverance of commitment, and the unwavering pursuit of justice. All, including many who have since achieved exalted station in practice, government, and judicial and academic life, regard Frank Hogan as a crucial shaping influence on their lives and careers. For he has imbued his associates with some of his own enthusiastic devotion to the task, his uncompromising efforts toward professional excellence, and guiding all, his acute awareness of the role of mercy in justice.

But Frank Hogan is not only a man of towering public stature, he is a warm, witty and wise person. While the unblemished reputation of the office eloquently attests the qualities of its chief, only Frank Hogan's close associates know his remarkable talents and personality. For although deeply involved in the daily work of the nation's busiest prosecutor's office, tirelessly attending to the details of the humblest as well as the most notorious cases, he shuns all personal publicity and modestly reassigns the plaudits enjoyed by the office; his is a genuine humility. Thus, only a relatively few know the countless instances demonstrating the high courage and great wisdom with which Frank Hogan has borne and exercised the enormous discretion inherent in the prosecutor's responsibility. Always restrained and deliberate in his decisions with an attentive and fine sensitivity to the rights of defendants, Frank Hogan is nonetheless energetic and persistent in the pursuit and prosecution of those who prey upon society. Privately, as well as publicly, he has always been entirely impervious to the pressures of the powerful. He fears no reprisal; he seeks no favor, his dedication to justice is complete.

His sound and practical judgment is complemented by the meticulous and finely honed skills of the legal craftsman. Add to this his uncanny ability to assess his fellow man, to recognize the strength and weakness of character, to separate true merit from false pretense, and the rarely seen picture of Frank Hogan begins to emerge. For such virtues as his office may boast are, in large measure, the attributes of its remarkable chief.

Outside the office bearing Frank Hogan's indelible imprint, the recipient of our Medal has long been active in community and University affairs. His loyalty to his Alma Mater has been demonstrated in many ways. In addition to serving as president of the Columbia College Alumni Association and of the University Alumni Federation, he has been a director of the Federation and chairman of the Columbia College Council. Presently he is a life trustee of the University and National Alumni Chairman for Columbia's capital campaign. He is a past president of the District Attorney's Association, trustee of the Knickerbocker Hospital, and a member of the City, State and American Bar Associations.

Frank Hogan has received the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws from Columbia University and Suffolk Law School. His Alma Mater has also awarded him the Columbia University Medal for Excellence for Public Service, the Alumni Federation's Medal for Conspicious Alumni Service, and the Alexander Hamilton Medal. He has also received the Medal for Merit from the New York Grand Jury Association, the Gold Medal from the American Irish Historical Society, the Medal of Merit of the St. Nicholas Society, and the Furtherance of Justice Award from the National District Attorneys Association. These are, all of them, tributes not to the office but to the man.

It is with pride in his distinguished service

in the law and with deepest respect for his matchless integrity that the Columbia Law Alumni bestow their Medal of Excellence on Frank S. Hogan.

A LOOK AT THE REAL GREECE

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on April 10 the Premier of Greece, George Papadopoulos, held a press conference in Athens. The subject of the press conference was certain relaxations of the country's laws and regulations in the light of the improved overall situation there. During the press conference Mr. Papadopoulos raised the question of the obligations of the individual to the society in which he lives. He made reference to the cult of absolute personal freedom, and wondered whether such a tendency might transform society into a jungle, a jungle that could be avoided only if the individual is willing to sacrifice part of his freedom for the well-being of those around him.

I think Mr. Papadopoulos has raised some good questions. I think that these same questions could well be raised with respect to some of the things that we are experiencing in our own country. I am not suggesting that the answer to our problems is to be found in the same fashion as has been deemed necessary in Greece. I do say however that we in this country should exercise restraint in criticizing the Greeks for the way they are running their country. We do not have Communist neighbors, we are not a target for Communist penetration, at least from across our borders. We have two wide oceans and two friendly countries with ideals and aspirations essentially the same as our own to our north and south. We can afford, so to speak, a relatively complacent and tolerant attitude that is not permitted the Greeks.

At this time our national policy toward Greece seems to be a quite unrealistic one, involving as it does something called selective suspension of the delivery of certain armaments under our military aid program. When we consider the importance of the strategic position that Greece occupies on the southern front of the Allied Command Europe this selective suspension in the shipment of essential equipment simply makes no sense.

Greece is not a rich country, its financial resources and its industrial capability is limited. Because of this, and because of its membership in NATO, Greece has had to depend on the United States for assistance in equipping its armed forces. The Communist threat is a constant one, and to be effective vigilance and military capability must match this threat. My conversations with responsible American military leaders give complete confirmation to my belief that if we do not regularize our relationship to Greece in the matter of furnishing military aid and assistance we may well find ourselves in very serious trouble in the Middle East.

As I understand it, we are supplying at this time some items required for the repair and maintenance of military equipment now in the hands of the Greeks. But other shipments, the need for which is becoming more and more critical, are now being held up for no apparent reason other than an attempt to mollify portions of the liberal element in the United States that does not seem to have much perception of what is really best for our country. The Greeks need aircraft, and tanks, and ships and if we do not furnish them in the fashion that we previously agreed we will be disregarding the realities of international life.

Every member nation of NATO has its assigned missions. We have ours and the Greeks have theirs. We have undertaken to assist the Greeks equipment-wise in performing the missions that are their job as part of NATO, but we are not living up to our commitments.

We should ask ourselves whether good sense dictates that we allow petulance, if that is the word, to take the place of clear thinking. I would ask myself just exactly what is best for us. And the answer is very clear: provide the Greeks what is necessary to carry out their missions in the Middle East. I want what is best for the furtherance of peace for our own country, for the Middle East, and for the world. As I see it these hopes can be substantially furthered by providing the Greek forces the means to do their part of the NATO job. It is that simple to me.

Some feel that the vision of Bulgaria, with the urging and help of the Soviet Union, striking across the middle of Greece to establish a Mediterranean port for the Communist world is unrealistic. I would rather not take that chance. Some say that it is an exaggeration to think that the Turkish Straits might be threatened or that the southern flank of NATO might be destroyed. Maybe they are right, but it is a gamble that I personally do not want to take.

Recently an American Air Force colonel said that when aircraft of our Air Force land in Greece, our people are treated just like the Greek Air Force and significantly that we are welcomed there. I think that we should reciprocate some of this feeling. I think we should view the Greeks for what they really are: a stalwart ally and a very necessary friend in one of the most dangerous and explosive parts of the world today. And we should implement this feeling and attitude in a tangible way by providing the Greeks the means to perform the mission that we—and NATO—has assigned to them.

TOWARD WAGE AND PRICE STABILITY

(Mr. WIDNALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today, I have cosponsored with Mr. BROCK, Mr. CONABLE, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio a House joint resolution on wage and price stability.

I doubt if there is anyone who is not disturbed by the recent economic turn of events. Consumer prices continue to climb at an annual rate of 6 percent, yet real gross national product has been declining for two quarters. Collective bargaining settlements have averaged in excess of 8 percent during the first quarter of this year, yet unemployment continues to rise. The futility of trying to keep up with a rising inflation is indicated by the fact that despite unusually large wage increases, the average worker is no better off in terms of real spendable earnings than he was a year ago. Some categories of wage earners have even lost ground over the past 12 months.

Generally accepted economic theory tells us that the rate of price and wage escalation must decline when the economy slows down and unemployment rises. Unfortunately, theory cannot tell us when this will happen. Economists also tell us that prices and wages can continue to rise during a downturn, but again, they cannot assure us that such objectionable conditions will be of short duration. To my mind, rising inflation in a declining economy has already continued long enough to indicate that something more must be done than merely wait for desirable results.

Last March, the minority members of the Joint Economic Committee issued their unanimous report on the state of the economy and prospects for the subsequent year. In this report, we discussed why we felt that direct wage and price controls, wage-price guideposts, and "jawboning" were all inappropriate in the current economic situation. However, we did recommend that the administration, through the President's Council of Economic Advisers, provide the public with data on major price and wage decisions that would promote public discussion and scrutiny of price and wage behavior.

Specifically, we stated:

> We recommend that the administration immediately announce the inflationary implications of unusually significant wage and price decisions. The Council of Economic Advisers should calculate and make public how much each price increase adds to the wholesale or consumer price index, and indicate other prices which would be adversely affected by such an increase. It should publish specific arguments why a particular industry feels it necessary to raise its prices, and suggest Government studies of situations where particular bottlenecks or unusual supply and demand conditions exist.
>
> Similarly, on the wage front, the Council should publish the price implications of unusual collective bargaining agreements, including the timing of the wage increases under different assumptions, the productivity experience of workers in the industry, the industry's profit situation and whether industry officials feel the increases will necessitate price increases.

It is important to note that we did not view this proposal as the first step on the road to direct wage and price controls. These are most inappropriate in any economic situation we can now foresee developing, and would do a great deal of harm at a great deal of Government expense. Specifically, we said:

> These activities should not be considered the foundation for more detailed intervention by the Government in individual wage and price decisions. However, we see no harm in opening up price and wage decisions which significantly affect the economy to the eyes of the public. Public scrutiny could well have inflationary consequences.

Mr. Speaker, today I introduce, on behalf of the House minority members of the Joint Economic Committee—Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. BROCK, Mr. CONABLE, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio—a joint resolution requesting the Council of Economic Advisers publish periodically, whenever conditions require but no less than once each month, the implications of unusually significant price and wage decisions proposed or announced in major industries. This resolution specifically requests the Administration to implement our March recommendation to promote wage and price stability. It is nearly identical with Senate Joint Resolution 203, introduced by Senator JACOB JAVITS on behalf of the Senate minority committee members.

We introduce this fully recognizing that many of the major economic policy officials in the administration have placed themselves on record against this or any other similar approach to the current economic situation. We hope, however, that the administration will realize that the country cannot wait until the economic slowdown produces the desired results. Just biding our time at this point will be much too costly in terms of labor unemployed and output lost.

Excessive demand is no longer the cause of our inflation, but rather scrambling by business and labor to catch up with each other. The current situation is most amenable to the pressures of public opinion that our proposal can bring to bear. It is important to note that Housing and Urban Development Secretary George Romney and Federal Reserve Chairman Arthur Burns have recently made similar proposals, after having opposed such measures in the past.

The administration has achieved its first objective of slowing the economy from its overheated expansion. We are convinced that in time this would provide for us our second objective of price and wage stability. However, the process must be hastened. The American economy cannot wait indefinitely for clear-cut results on the price and wage front. An administration indicating its awareness of major price and wage decisions, and setting out the implications for all to see would go a long way toward making economic stability a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I include the joint resolution in the RECORD at this point:

JOINT RESOLUTION

Whereas the goals of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power set forth in the Employment Act of 1946 affirm the need for price stability,

Whereas the level of inflation presently affecting the national economy is causing severe hardship and a loss of purchasing power for many citizens, and

Whereas an informed public debate, in the fight against inflation, would mark a significant advance towards our economic policy goals: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That until December 31, 1971, the Council of Economic Advisers is hereby requested to publish, periodically, but at least once a month, with whatever assistance may be required from other executive branch departments and agencies:

(1) the implications of unusually significant price decisions made or proposed in major industries during the preceding month,

(2) the implications of unusually significant collective bargaining agreements entered into in major industries during the preceding month, and

(3) such other data on price and wage developments as the Council deems beneficial to the public interest.

Sec. 2(a) With respect to the data referred to in paragraph (1) of the first section, each analysis should indicate how the price decisions set forth therein can be expected to influence overall consumer and wholesale price levels, how they might affect other prices in related industries, and the arguments made by particular companies or industries why such price increases are deemed necessary.

(b) With respect to the data referred to in paragraph (2) of the first section, each analysis should indicate the magnitude of wage and benefit increases, under different timing assumptions, represented by the proposals set forth therein; the productivity experience and wage experience in the industry; and whether industry officials believe such increases would bring about price increases.

BROWARD JUNIOR COLLEGE, COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT CHARLES E. PERRY, FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, in this age, when our Nation's young people are actively engaged in expressing their opinions on the myriad of problems which affect us today, there are wise voices which encourage this involvement to be directed towards constructive channels.

One of these voices is that of Charles E. Perry, president of Florida International University. In his address to the 1970 graduating class of Broward Junior College, President Perry challenged the young men and women to accept the responsibility of citizenship by becoming involved in public and governmental affairs. I would like President Perry's fine speech included in the RECORD at this point:

TELL IT LIKE IT IS

(By President Charles E. Perry)

President Adams, members of the faculty, distinguished guest, ladies and gentlemen of the Broward Junior College Class of 1970.

I am not going to deliver the typical commencement speech tonight; the kind of speech which applauds you, the members of the graduating class, for the splendid job you have done in getting this far in your academic career; or the kind which discusses how you have overcome hardships and made sacrifices; or how you are going to go on to bigger and greater accomplishments—even though all of these things are true.

I am also not going to give you the traditional commencement address which points out how you will be the leaders of tomorrow, and that overnight you will become a highly paid corporation executive, a successful professional, a top government official, or even a college president.

And I am not going to tell you that life is pleasant and bright, and that once you have the A.A. or A.S. degree in your hand, the world and a high paying job are yours for the asking.

In addition, I am not going to use this special occasion in your life for an oratorical workout to show you how "cool" I am with words. Motherhood, apple pie, George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and even Babe Ruth will be pushed aside this evening, although they all had their place in traditional commencement speeches.

No, I am not going to talk about these things tonight, because I am going to *tell it like it is.*

Tell it like it is. This has become a notable phrase in our modern-day language, signifying honesty and candor, but often used to the point of being meaningless. Yet, I wonder, if we had been willing to *tell it like it is* a long time ago, and had come to grips with the real priorities in our national life, would we not now be so deeply enmeshed in the problems confronting us today?

In fact, if we dare be so bold to *tell it like it is,* it could result in some unprecedented soul-searching among Americans of all ages, and particularly among young Americans who find themselves inheriting a world they did not make, but in which they must live.

Telling it like it is may be very frightening to many older Americans. They see not only questioning and dissent, they see rejection, they see rebellion and, ultimately, they see the possibility of revolution. And it frightens them.

But it also frightens many young Americans because they don't understand why the "over 30" generation is not more concerned about the problems facing this nation of ours. And in a nation that is united by allegiance and by a shared heritage, it is not a hopeful symptom for the future when the old fear the young, when the suburbs fear the cities, when Americans of one color distrust Americans of another color and when votes are cast not thoughtfully, but in fear or in anger.

Accelerating change in this nation is producing a great many new problems and aggravating old ones, leaving nothing untouched, aside from your own personal concerns about just plain living, the changes related to the precarious balance of nations between war and peace, particularly in Southeast Asia, inflation and the high cost of living, the need for more and better jobs, the pollution of our environment, the increasing alienation of our people (young and old alike), the problems of racial injustice, and the darkening shadows of national poverty—face all of us today.

You can say that you did not cause these things—and you will be right. Most of you are not old enough to have to take that kind of blame, but, young as you are, you are now allowed to be full participants in this society of ours. This didn't used to be so. I guess I myself, am a good example of the new era.

At the age of 32, I was selected to be the first president of the new state university to serve Dade and Broward counties. It is a great honor—and an even greater responsibility. But my point is that it would have been unthinkable to have given someone of my youth this responsibility and authority a few short years ago.

Like all the things we deal with, this change in attitude has two sides to it. It means greater opportunity and a far more significant status in society for people of your age and my age. But it also means the imposition of much greater responsibility at a very early state of adult life.

I don't mean just income or job responsibility. I mean the responsibilities of citizenship. The responsibility for making the kind of choices every adult constantly faces in a free society. When leaders were in their 40's and 50's and 60's, young people in their 20's were considered to be babes in arms. They were not expected to be very responsible in terms of citizenship—and they weren't usually given much of an opportunity to show they could be responsible citizens.

But now that has changed—and I think it has changed for the better. There is no reason

whatever—and really there never was—why people of your age and my age could not take and handle this kind of responsibility. We have shown we could in one continuing situation throughout history—and that is in war. Now we have both the opportunity and the obligation to show we can do as much in peace . . . if that condition ever comes to this "war-weary" nation of ours.

What does what I've said so far really mean? How does it affect you and the things you do?

First of all, it means you have to understand the kind of world you are living in. It is no good just being "against" the world or the conditions in it. It has never been very different. It has never been kind or friendly or very peaceful. And this world has only made the bits and pieces of progress we call freedom at the expense of enormous human effort.

That human effort was made not by chance—but by choice. It was exerted by people just like you and me who lived with the belief and the conviction that things could be made better and that they could, in some small way, help achieve that condition. You have the same opportunity; that is, if you choose to take it.

I don't mean being concerned or being dedicated on a short-term basis. That's easy. The tough thing is to be concerned and dedicated all the time, even when your own personal and family demands are increasing or when there is a great desire to say, "the hell with it, let someone else worry about it for awhile."

My friends, there is no someone else. There is only you. No one will pick up the torch you put down. It will just go out and there will be that much less light and that much less fire and that much less effort to make of this world. A slightly better and somewhat more liveable place than it is today.

There are so very many ways of turning your back on the problems of your world. You can become involved in study. You can be concerned only about your own job. You can get immersed in the details of living. You can do all this and still complain, but who will "take up the battle?" Who will be concerned enough to do something about prejudice, about quality education, about justice and equal opportunity, about drug abuse, about inflation, about pollution, about the ghetto, about war and about crime in our streets? *You can,* or you can just give up.

You can take the position that nothing any of us can do will make the slightest bit of difference. And so you will no longer try. You will say you are a good and a fine person—but since the bad and the evil ones outnumber you, you are resigning from the team.

There is really no end to the excuses and, in time, you will see them all used. But I hope you will not yield. I hope you will not use them. I want you to stay just as concerned and just as dedicated as most of you are now. I want you to keep on questioning, to keep on being dissatisfied.

There are solutions to all the problems we face, but it's going to take an enormous and a sustained effort to find them. It's going to take some pretty blind faith and lot of brainpower. And it's going to take a "deep down gut belief" that things in America don't have to be the way they are.

We need to examine our nation's institutions—the government, the educational system, the business establishment, and so on—but we need much, much more to examine our personal priorities. Institutions are impersonal. They do nothing on their own, much as we may like to think they cause the evils that beset us. It is people who activate institutions. And it is people—people like you and me—who can change them, who can make them responsive.

All of us are aware of what has happened on American campuses since 1960. In the past decade, students have achieved greater personal freedom than in the prior half century. The doctrine of *in loco parentis,* for example, is almost gone. Parental rules governing campus activities are fast disappearing. And this is a result of the fact that students no longer want to be treated like children. They want to be treated like adults, and with that they must be willing to take on certain responsibilities. And in most cases, students have been very capable in assuming this new burden.

The 1960's also included much needed reforms in American higher education and I hope more will come, one of the changes that will greatly assist the learning experience is centered around the concept of giving students a major role in all university programs—from curriculum planning, to governance, to evaluation of programs and professors.

In addition, students are now turning their attention to problems off the campus, their concern about the "real world" will have a tremendous positive effect on the future programs of the nation's colleges and universities. The days when the institutions of higher education can divorce themselves from the problems of our society are over.

For example, last Wednesday, Earth Day, I spoke to an audience in Miami on the role of the urban university in the fight to improve our urban environment. Many activities were held to draw attention to how we are mistreating our environment, and Earth Day turned out to be fairly successful in that regard. But more needs to be done and one day's effort is certainly not going to be enough. Every day is really Earth Day, and I urge you to continue to be concerned about "Planet Earth."

But I hope that your concern for the environment is not based upon the fact that it's "in vogue" to talk about ecology these days. In fact, there are people making speeches now on this subject that did not even know the definition of ecology six months ago.

And I hope that you will not take the easy way out by blaming business and industry for all the problems of pollution and our environment. They have been the "scapegoat" for many attacks, but we must all share the responsibility for these vast problems and we must all work together—education, business, government and private citizens—to solve these complex problems facing our nation.

In addition, I hope that you will not forget that it was the black man that first started to "talk about" the problems of the environment. He was the first to complain about the stench of the ghetto, the lack of clean air and water, and the almost unbearable sanitary conditions that he lived in. But the black man's voice was not heard . . . or if heard, it was not listened to with much sincerity or desire to do something about it.

So, let's not "cop-out" by using the now fashionable jargon of ecology and forget some of the basic problems still facing Americans of all colors . . . whether those are problems related to education, to housing, to transportation, to better and more jobs, and so on.

There are lots of ways to help solve these problems—lots of ways to become involved in the many problems of society and most all of them will show results. Ladies and gentlemen of the class of 1970, working to change our nation is a tough job, but by being involved together—businessman, teacher, government worker and citizen—it can be done!

One of the major ways to get involved is to be concerned about government and politics. A lot of people in this nation act as if politics is something "dirty." But in a free society, the political process *is* government, and the way to affect government or to make government responsive to the needs of society is to become involved in politics.

There will probably be on the ballot in November a constitutional amendment to give 18-year olds the right to vote in Florida. *I'm all for it.* But where 18-year olds have been given the right to vote, not too many of them use it. In fact, I'm disappointed to tell you that the percentage of voters under 30 who have used their right to vote is far below those voters over 30. That is not just non-involvement, that is a total refusal to use the most precious right that you and I have in this free nation of ours.

The day you have the privilege of voting, register to vote. Pick a party, *or,* if you don't like parties, pick a candidate. And then go to work for him. Every candidate needs all the help he or she can get, and none can get elected without it. If you want to be involved and see change, get out and work for it!

And when the election is over, don't forget about the people you elected. Keep a check on what they do, and what they don't do. And let them hear from you. No one in America—absolutely no one—has a more sensitive feedback mechanism than an elected officeholder. The problem is that they seldom hear from anyone except paid lobbyists, extremists on the far right or the far left, or from other officeholders. If they hear from you, they'll react. It's all part of the input every officeholder is constantly using, and it affects their votes in city councils, state legislatures, or the congress, and their vote in those governmental bodies affect your lives in many, many ways.

And your involvement will affect the future of Florida. You know, Florida is a wonderful place to live, to work, and to raise a family. It's a state that's among the big 10 of the 50. And it's the fastest growing of the big 10. How Florida grows and how it develops will decide how you and your children and their children will live. It will mean the difference between swimming in clean water or staying out of polluted water. It will means good schools and good roads and good law enforcement, or bad schools, bad roads, and bad law enforcement. It will mean good jobs, or bad jobs, and possibly no jobs.

These are the kinds of choices you will be making—and, remember, if you do nothing, that is a choice too. *Negative, but still a choice.*

Tonight is a significant landmark in your lives. You will often look back to it as marking a dividing line in the time of your life. I hope you will also look back on it as marking a dividing line in the *tone* of your life. I want the tone of your life to reflect your involvement and dedication. Will you be a lifter or a leaner? A creator or a conformist? A driver or a drifter? These choices are yours, but, remember, the old biblical phrase: "As a man thinks . . . so he is."

In closing, let me say that it is not nearly as difficult for me to *tell it like it is,* as it will be for you to get involved and to stay involved tomorrow, the next day, and all the days that follow. Whether you agree or disagree, are for or against, is not half as important as being involved and taking a stand. This state and this nation are not finished. They are still being shaped and moulded. Don't let anyone—and don't let yourself through noninvolvement—deprive you of the right . . . not just the chance, *but the right* to place your imprint on the America that you will leave to a new generation.

NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR THE ELDERLY

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, May marks Senior Citizens Month. We, in Congress, can pause and reflect with pride on the

extensive legislation and the many programs that have been enacted to meet the needs of this constantly growing group. But we must, at the same time, reflect on those needs that remain neglected.

We are aware of many of the unique problems of income, health, and housing which beset the elderly, and despite the great strides made by Congress in meeting these problems, much remains to be done in other areas.

There is an acute need—the need for nourishing, well-balanced meals in a social setting—and I have introduced legislation that would, for the first time, institute a program to meet those needs on a nationwide basis.

The elderly person who finds himself robbed of friends, close relatives, and neighbors by death, time, and change, has been the subject of intensive research in this area. Mrs. Sandra Howell, project director for the Gerontological Society, described the results of inadequate diet in testimony before the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs last fall.

When poor nutrition exists and persists in the older adults, it serves to intensify the severity of other conditions which accompany the processes of aging. By not specifically dealing with the problems of adequate diet in the elderly (we encourage) the spiral of chronic disease, physical and psychic disability, and ultimate institutionalization.

The hearings of this committee resulted in a strong recommendation for legislation that would provide a comprehensive nutrition program in a social setting. Among the programs discussed in the hearings were the demonstration projects conducted by the Administration on Aging under title IV—research and development grants, which evidenced not only their desirability, but their feasibility. Twenty-seven projects were carried out during a 3-year period in 17 States and were concluded in the fall of 1969.

The bill I introduced last week will implement this recommendation and will meet the acute need for a national policy aimed at providing the elderly with low-cost, nutritionally sound meals served in strategically located centers such as community centers, senior citizen centers, schools, and other public or private nonprofit institutions suited to such use. Besides promoting better health among the older segment of our population through improved nutrition, such a program, implemented through the use of a variety of community resources, would be a means of promoting greater opportunity for social contact, ending the isolation of old age, increasing participants' knowledge of nutrition and health in general, and promoting positive mental health and independence through the encouragement of greater physical and mental activities.

This bill provides for Federal, State, and local funding on a matching basis, including the utilization of surplus commodity programs for the preparation of at least one hot meal per day at a reasonable low cost to the participant.

I urge earnest consideration of my bill and welcome all who wish to join with me as cosponsors. Today's senior citizens, after a lifetime of hard work, a career interrupted by the great depression and war, faces a future of existing on a sum which is only 20 to 40 percent of his former earnings. Even with the medicare legislation, the older American sees medical costs looming large in their budget. For many persons living on a fixed income, the only flexible portion of their budget is food. Rent and taxes must be paid; medical costs are given high priority and consequently money must come from the already skimpy food budget. Not all are aware the medicine does little good to a body consistently deprived of the proper nourishment, and those who do know this often are in no position to do anything about it. My bill, which I now submit for the RECORD, offers Congress an opportunity to do something about it:

H.R. 17763

A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide grants to States for the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of low-cost meal programs, nutrition training and education programs, opportunity for social contacts, and for other purposes

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

SECTION 1. Title VII of the Older Americans Act of 1965 is redesignated as title VIII, and sections 701 through 705 of that Act are respectively redesignated as sections 801 through 805.

SEC. 2. Section 102(1) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 is amended by deleting the semicolon and inserting a comma and inserting immediately thereafter the words "except for the purposes of title VII where the term 'Secretary' shall mean the Secretary of Agriculture."

SEC. 3. The Older Americans Act of 1965 is amended by inserting the following new title immediately after title VI thereof:

"TITLE VII—NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR THE ELDERLY

"FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

"SEC. 701. (a) The Congress finds that the research and development grants, title IV, Older Americans Act, nutrition program has demonstrated the effectiveness of and the need for permanent nationwide programs to provide the nutritional and social needs of millions of persons aged sixty-five or older who are unable to overcome the complex and intertwining problems of inadequate diets. Many of these elderly persons do not eat adequately because they cannot afford to do so, while others, who are economically better off, do not eat well because they lack the skills to select and prepare nourishing and well-balanced meals, have limited mobility which may impair their capacity to shop and cook for themselves, and have feelings of rejection and loneliness which obliterate the incentive necessary to prepare and eat a meal alone. These and other physiological, psychological, social, and economic changes that occur with aging result in a pattern of living, which causes malnutrition and further physical and mental deterioration.

"(b) In addition to the food stamp program, commodity distribution systems and old-age income benefits, there is an acute need for a national policy aimed at providing the elderly with low cost, nutritionally sound meals served in strategically located centers such as community centers, senior citizen centers, schools, and other public or private non-profit institutions suited to such use and through other means toward this purpose. Besides promoting better health among the older segment of our population through improved nutrition, such a program, implemented through the use of a variety of community resources, would be a means of promoting greater opportunity for social contact ending the isolation of old age, increasing participants' knowledge of nutrition and health in general, and promoting positive mental health and independence through the encouragement of greater physical and mental activities.

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 702. (a) In order to effectively carry out the purposes of this title, the Secretary shall—

"(1) create a new division within the Food and Nutrition Service of the Department of Agriculture, under the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Consumer Services, for the administration of the program;

"(2) make full utilization of the existing services within the Department including but not limited to the Federal Extension Service under the Director of Science and Education; and

"(3) consult with the Administration on Aging, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) In carrying out the provisions of this title, the Secretary is authorized to request the technical assistance and cooperation of the Department of Labor, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Transportation, and such other departments and agencies of the Federal Government as may be appropriate.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to use, with their consent, the services, equipment, personnel, and facilities of Federal and other agencies with or without reimbursement, and on a similar basis to cooperate with other public and private agencies and instrumentalities in the use of services, equipment, personnel, and facilities.

"(d) In carrying out the purposes of this title, the Secretary is authorized to provide consultative services and technical assistance to any public or private nonprofit institution or organization, agency, or political subdivision of a State; to provide short-term training and technical instruction; and to collect, prepare, publish, and disseminate special educational or informational materials, including reports of the projects for which funds are provided under this title.

"ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS

"SEC. 703. (a)(1) From the sum appropriated for a fiscal year under section 708(A) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, shall each be allotted an amount equal to one-fourth of 1 per centum of such sum and (B) each other State shall be allotted an amount equal to one-half of 1 per centum of such sum.

"(2) From the remainder of the sum so appropriated for a fiscal year each State shall be allotted an additional amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the population aged sixty-five or over in such State bears to the population aged sixty-five or over in all of the States, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

"(3) A State's allotment for a fiscal year under this title shall be equal to the sum of the amount allotted to it under paragraphs (1) and (2).

"(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Secretary determines will not be required for that year shall be available for reallotment, from time to time and on such dates during such year as the Secretary may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for that year, but with such proporionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Secretary estimates such

State needs and will be able to use for such year; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Such reallotments shall be made on the basis of the State plan so approved, after taking into consideration the population aged sixty-five or over. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for that year.

"(c) The allotment of any State under subsection (a) for any fiscal year shall be available for grants to pay up to 90 per centum of the costs of projects in such State described in section 705 and approved by such State in accordance with its State plan approved under section 705. Such allotment to any State in any fiscal year shall be made upon the condition that the Federal allotment will be matched during each fiscal year by 10 per centum, or more, as the case may be, from funds within the State.

"(d) If, in any State, the State agency is not permitted by law to disburse the funds paid to it under this title in the State, or is not permitted by law to match Federal funds made available for use by such public or private nonprofit institutions or organization, agency, or political subdivision of a State, the Secretary shall withhold the allotment of funds to such State referred to in subsection (a). The Secretary shall disburse the funds so withheld directly to any public or private nonprofit institution or organization, agency, or political subdivision of such State in accordance with the provisions of this title, including the requirements that any such payment or payments shall be matched in the proportion specified in subsection (c) for such State, by funds from sources within the State.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 704. (a) Funds allotted to any State pursuant to section 703 during a fiscal year shall be available for payment to such State for disbursement by the State agency in accordance with such agreements not inconsistent with the provisions of this title as may be entered into by the Secretary and such State agency, for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this title, during such fiscal year in supplying—

"(1) agriculture commodities and other foods for consumption by persons aged sixty-five or over, and

"(2) nonfood assistance in furtherance of the programs authorized under this title.

"(b) The Secretary shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time the amounts to be paid to any State under this section and the time or times such amounts are to be paid to any State under this section and the time or times such amounts are to be paid; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the State at the time or times fixed by the Secretary the amounts so certified.

"STATE PLANS

"SEC. 705. (a) Any State which desires to receive allotments under this title shall submit to the Secretary for approval a State plan for purposes of this title which—

"(1) establishes or designated a single State agency as the sole agency for administering or supervising the administration of the plan, which agency shall be the agency primarily responsible for coordination of State programs and activities related to the purposes of this title;

"(2) sets forth such policies and procedures as will provide satisfactory assurance that allotments paid to the State under the provisions of this title will be expended—

"(A) to make grants in cash or in kind to any public or private nonprofit institution or organization, agency, or political subdivision of a State (hereinafter referred to 'recipient of a grant or contract')—

"(i) to carry out the program as described in section 706.

"(ii) to provide up to 90 per centum of the costs of the purchase and preparation of the food; delivery of the meals; and such other reasonable expenses as may be incurred in providing nutrition services to persons aged sixty-five or over. Recipients of grants of contracts may charge participating individuals for meals furnished but such charge shall not exceed a per meal limit to be established by each State agency, taking into consideration the income ranges of eligible individuals in local communities and other sources of income of the recipients of a grant or a contract.

"(iii) to provide up to 90 per centum of the costs of such supporting services as may be absolutely necessary such as the costs of social services and local public transportation to and from the residences of participating individuals to the extent such costs are not provided by grants for these services from the Administration on Aging, Department of Transportation, Office of Economic Opportunity, or other Federal agency.

"(B) to provide for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan: *Provided*, That the amount expended for such administration and planning shall not exceed a sum which shall be agreed upon between the Secretary and the State agency—

"(i) in making report, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may require to carry out his functions under this title, including reports of the objective measurements required by section 706, and keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports and proper disbursement of Federal funds under this title, and

"(ii) in providing satisfactory assurance that such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures will be adopted as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid under this title to the State, including any such funds paid by the State to the recipient of a grant or contract.

"(3) provides such methods of administration (including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Secretary shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods) as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan.

"(b) The Secretary shall approve any State plan which he determines meets the requirements and purposes of this section.

"(c) Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to such State agency, finds (1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of this title, or (2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision or with any requirements set forth in the application of a recipient of a grant or contract approved pursuant to such plan, the Secretary shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State under the provisions of this title (or in his discretion, that further payments to the State will be limited to programs or projects under the State plan, or portions thereof, not affected by the failure, or that the State agency shall not make further payments under this part to specified local agencies affected by the failure) until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, the Secretary shall make no further payments to the State under this title, or shall limit payments to recipients of grants or contracts under, or parts of, the State plan affected by the failure or payments to the State agency under this part shall be limited to recipients of grants or contracts not affected by the failure, as the case may be.

"(d)(1) If any State is dissatisfied with the Secretary's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under subsection (c), such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary. The Secretary thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceeding on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"(2) The findings of fact by the Secretary, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Secretary to take further evidence, and the Secretary may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

"(3) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretry or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

"NUTRITION AND OTHER PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

"SEC. 706. Funds allotted to any State during any fiscal year pursuant to section 703 shall be disbursed by the State agency to recipients of grants or contracts who agree—

"(1) to establish a program (hereinafter referred to as a 'nutrition program') which, five or more days per week, provides at least one hot meal per day and any additional meals, hot or cold, each of which assures a minimum of one-third of the daily recommended dietary allowances as established by the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council;

"(2) to provide such nutrition program for individuals aged sixty-five or over (hereinafter referred to as 'eligible individuals');

"(3) to furnish a site for such nutrition program in as close proximity to the majority of eligible individuals' residences as feasible, and, preferably within walking distance;

"(4) to utilize methods of administration including outreach which will assure that the maximum number of eligible individuals may have an opportunity to participate in such nutrition program;

"(5) to provide a setting conducive to expanding the nutritional program to include recreational activities, informational, health and welfare counseling and referral services;

"(6) to include such training as may be necessary to enable the personnel to carry out the provisions of this title;

"(7) to establish and administer the nutritional program with the advice of persons competent in the field of service in which the nutrition program is being provided, and of persons who are knowledgeable with regard to the needs of elderly persons;

"(8) to provide an opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness, feasibility and cost of each particular type of such program; and

"(9) to give preference to persons aged sixty-five or over for any staff positions, full- or part-time, for which such persons qualify.

"SURPLUS COMMODITIES

"SEC. 707. Each recipient of a grant or contract shall, insofar as practicable, utilize in its nutrition program commodities designated from time to time by the Secretary as being in abundance, either nationally or in the local area, or commodities donated by the Secretary. Commodities purchased under the authority of section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774), as amended, may be donated by the Secretary to the recipient of a grant or contract, in accordance with the needs as determined by the recipient of a grant or contract, for utilization in the nutritional program under this title. The Secretary is authorized to prescribe terms and conditions respecting the use of commodities donated under such section 32, as will maximize the nutritional and financial contributions of such donated commodities in such public or private nonprofit institutions or organizations, agencies, or political subdivisions of a State.

"APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 708. (a) The Secretary may utilize the programs authorized under this title in carrying out the provisions of clause (2) of section 32 of the Act approved August 24, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 774, 7 U.S.C. 614c).

"(b) In addition to any other funds which may be available, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

"PROGRAM EXPENDITURES

"SEC. 709. Of the sums appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to the authorization contained in section 708 of this title, not to exceed $50,000,000 shall be made available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, not to exceed $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, not to exceed $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, for grants-in-aid pursuant to the provisions of this title, less—

"(1) not to exceed 3½ per centum thereof which per centum is hereby made available to the Secretary for his administrative expenses under this title;

"(2) direct expenditures by the Secretary for agricultural commodities and other foods to be distributed among the States and such public or private nonprofit institutions or organizations, agencies, or political subdivisions of a State, participating in the nutrition program under this tile.

"RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS

"SEC. 710. No part of the cost of any program under this title may be treated as income or benefits to any eligible individual for the purpose of any other program or provision of State or Federal law.

"MISCELLANEOUS

"SEC. 711. None of the provisions of this title shall be construed to prevent a recipient of a grant or a contract from entering into an agreement with a profitmaking organization to carry out the provisions and purposes of this title."

MIDEAST COLORED BY RED PILOTS

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, we are all deeply concerned today about the critical condition in the Middle East which has been aggravated by the planes of Russian military personnel engaged in operational activities with at least the Egyptian Air Force. It seems to me this situation has created a greater danger of general war in the Middle East than apparently now exists anywhere in the world.

One of our able circuit judges in Dade County and one of my warm friends, Judge Milton A. Friedman, has written a letter about this vital matter and enclosed a statement about the activity of the Russian pilots in the Middle East, both of which are very pertinent to the present critical situation and they appear following my remarks in the RECORD:

MILTON A. FRIEDMAN,
Miami, Fla., May 18, 1970.

Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER,
U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CLAUDE: The United States is so horribly involved with Viet Nam and Cambodia that what is happening in the Middle East tends to get lost in the shuffle. Yet the interest of the United States is unalterably bound up with the democracy of Israel and its status as a nation. The Russian influence in the world would be much stronger should the Arab nations prevail with the help of Russia than if the United States would prevail in Asia.

Because this is so true, I should like to call to your attention the enclosed article with its positive proof that the Russians are now actively participating in the Arab-Israel conflict. I have marked off exactly what the Russians are doing.

The least the United States could do is supply Israel with planes, replacement of material, etc. I am by no means advocating the use of United States force. It is ridiculous to state that Israel has airplane supremacy over all the Arab nations particularly with France giving 110 planes to Libya which doesn't have a pilot and which everyone knows means transfer of said planes to Egypt.

Please use your good offices to guaranty the continuance of support to Israel of planes and materiel. It is for the best interest of the United States. Appreciating your cooperation,

Sincerely yours,
Judge MILTON A. FRIEDMAN.

MIDEAST COLORED BY RED PILOTS
(By Winston Churchill)

TEL AVIV.—Direct Soviet military intervention in the Middle East has brought about the most critical situation since the six-day war of 1967.

There can be no doubt whatever that Russian pilots are today flying operationally in Egypt, providing the air defense of Cairo and Alexandria. It is not the civilian population of the cities that the Russians are defending—the Israelis have never threatened them.

They are there to defend Egyptian military installations and army units and above all give protection to the S.A.M. missile sites being built by Soviet technicians.

It was on April 18, when two Israel aircraft engaged in a deep penetration of Egyptian air space were intercepted and pursued by a formation of MIG21 fighters flown by Russians, that the Israelis first had confirmation of the Soviet involvement of which they had become aware a few days before.

The Israel government's belief has been confirmed by Robert McCloskey, the U.S. State Department spokesman, from what he described as "independent sources." The principal independent source was clearly the Russians themselves who have given private assurances to the Americans that their pilots would be operating only within Egyptian territory.

Further confirmation, if such were necessary, can be inferred from the fact that Alexsei N. Kosygin, the Soviet prime minister, in his news conference in Moscow recently did not choose explicitly to deny the charges under questioning by western correspondents.

It is now clear, in spite of recent press speculation to the contrary, that the fact that Russian pilots are today providing the air defense of Cairo and Alexandria is not attributable to Israel's deep penetration of Egyptian air space.

Israel's deep penetration raids against military targets in the vicinity of Cairo did not begin until last January. Before that date the Russians had already taken the decision to supply Egypt with an integrated air defense system which was clearly dependent on Soviet air protection for its construction and deployment.

The Russian decision was taken in response to requests by the Egyptian government which since last July had found its 1,500 pieces of artillery and armor along the Suez Canal subjected to the full fury of Israel air attacks in retaliation for Egypt's flagrant and self-confessed violation of the cease-fire with massive artillery barrages.

In spite of persistent attempts to rebuild S.A.M. missile sites on the canal zone, the sites were no sooner completed than they were knocked out by Israel air attacks.

President Nasser's proclaimed "war of attrition" against Israel was proving overwhelmingly more costly to Egypt in men and equipment than to Israel. It had reached such a point that Nasser was faced with the prospect of either having to abandon the shelling and reestablish a cease-fire or of calling on the Russians. He chose the latter course of action, and went to Moscow.

What Russia is today supplying to Egypt is not just a handful of S.A.M. 3 surface-to-air missiles but a complete integrated air defense system comprising: radar stations, control centers, S.A.M. 2 and S.A.M. 3 missiles and new 28 mm. radar-controlled antiaircraft guns in quadruple mountings on tank chassis. In addition she is supplying the men to build and operate the installations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for May 27, 1970, on account of illness.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), indefinitely, on account of serious illness in family.

Mr. MATSUNAGA (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. PATTEN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOREMAN) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCDADE, for 5 minutes, on May 27.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PREYER of North Carolina) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FARBSTEIN, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN, for 30 minutes today.

Mr. HENDERSON, for 15 minutes today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FLYNT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TALCOTT to revise and extend his remarks on the Yates amendment.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOREMAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCEWEN.

Mr. MESKILL.

Mr. BURKE of Florida in two instances.

Mr. GUDE.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

Mr. SPRINGER.

Mr. MIZE.

Mr. WHITEHURST.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. FOREMAN in two instances.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. REID of New York in three instances.

Mr. HORTON in six instances.

Mr. WYLIE.

Mr. WYDLER in two instances.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. DELLENBACK.

Mr. BEALL of Maryland.

Mr. GOODLING in two instances.

Mr. ESHLEMAN.

Mr. GROSS.

Mr. WATSON.

Mr. FISH.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. QUIE.

Mr. DUNCAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PREYER of North Carolina) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LONG of Maryland in six instances.

Mr. KYROS in two instances.

Mr. RIVERS in two instances.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Mr. FALLON.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. PUCINSKI in 10 instances.

Mr. CHAPPELL in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.

Mr. PIKE.

Mr. ECKHARDT in two instances.

Mr. MARSH in five instances.

Mr. GETTYS in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. BRASCO.

Mr. COHELAN.

Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI.

Mr. CAREY in two instances.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana in two instances.

Mr. ADDABBO.

Mr. KOCH.

Mr. LEGGETT in five instances.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina in two instances.

Mr. KARTH in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 1, 1970

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 646, 91st Congress, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, June 1, 1970.

Thereupon (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.) pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 646, the House adjourned until Monday, June 1, 1970, 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:

2088. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of a map entitled "Major Natural Gas Pipelines, as of December 31, 1969"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2089. A letter from the Chairman, the Renegotiation Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 17802. A bill to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act (Rept. No. 91-1130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 17495. A bill to increase the availability of mortgage credit for the financing of urgently needed housing, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 91—1131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. JONAS, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. RUTH, Mr. GROVER, Mr. WINN, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. RARICK, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. FOREMAN, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, and Mr. MARTIN):

H.R. 17820. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONAS (for himself, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. RUTH, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. CEDERBERG):

H.R. 17821. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUTH (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. JONAS, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. FREY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. MCDONALD of Michigan, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. COWGER, and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 17822. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIZELL (for himself, Mr. RUTH, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. JONAS, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. MYERS, Mr. PELLY, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. FOREMAN, Mr. BELCHER, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, and Mr. GROSS):

H.R. 17823. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.R. 17824. A bill to amend existing Federal disaster assistance legislation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. MCCULLOCH, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. RYAN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. MANN, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. POFF, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. SANDMAN, and Mr. RAILSBACK):

H.R. 17825. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. MCCULLOCH, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. FISH, Mr. COUGHLIN, and Mr. MAYNE):

H.R. 17826. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 17827. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 17828. A bill to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to provide Federal assistance for the expansion of facilities for public colleges and universities which admit students from out of State on a nondiscriminatory basis; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. REES, Mr. RODINO, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 17829. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide rates of pay for postal field service employees in certain areas and locations in accordance with private enterprise pay rates in these areas to assist in recruitment and retention of postal field service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GARMATZ (for himself, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. CLARK, Mr. PELLY, Mr. LENNON, and Mr. KEITH):

H.R. 17830. A bill to promote the safety of ports, harbors, waterfront areas, and navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 17831. A bill to reestablish the 1-cent postage rate for postal cards and post cards; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 17832. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to add two Members of Congress to the National Security Council; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MINISH (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. PODELL, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. KOCH, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. DENT, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. POWELL, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. NIX, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. EILBERG):

H.R. 17833. A bill to amend section 401 (e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that the Civil Aeronautics Board shall have authority to regulate the type of service performed by an air carrier under the terms of any certificate issued under that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MINISH (for himself, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. HUNT, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. ROE, Mr. PATTEN, and Mr. WIDNALL):

H.R. 17834. A bill to amend section 401(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that the Civil Aeronautics Board shall have authority to regulate the type of service performed by an air carrier under the terms of any certificate issued under that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MINISH (for himself, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. REES, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HANLEY, and Mr. ASHLEY):

H.R. 17835. A bill to amend section 401(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that the Civil Aeronautics Board shall have authority to regulate the type of service performed by an air carrier under the terms of any certificate issued under that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 17836. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 5-percent increase in annuities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 17837. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to naturalization fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 17838. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to bring to bear an informed public opinion upon price and wage behavior which threatens national economic stability; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 17839. A bill to extend the life of the Indian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 17840. A bill to amend title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to bar discrimination based on religion or ancestry in programs administered by institutions of higher education which are under public supervision and control and which receive Federal assistance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 17841. A bill relating to the tax treatment of transfers of rights to copyrights and literary, musical, and artistic compositions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 17842. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. MOSS, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. UDALL, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. PODELL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. ROE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. MANN, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. BARING, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. ANDERSON of California):

H.R. 17843. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide additional protection to marine and wildlife ecology by requiring the designation of certain water and submerged lands areas where the depositing of certain waste materials will be permitted, to authorize the establishment of standards with respect to such deposits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 17844. A bill to amend section 17 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income up to $300 per month of scholarships and fellowship grants for which the performance of services is required; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. STEPHENS, and Mr. ST GERMAIN):

H.R. 17845. A bill to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. QUIE (for himself, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. MONAGAN, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ESCH, and Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin):

H.R. 17846. A bill to assist school districts to meet special problems incident to desegregation in elementary and secondary schools and to provide financial assistance to improve education in racially impacted areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 17847. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROTH (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. POWELL, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, and Mr. MURPHY of New York):

H.R. 17848. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize reduced rate transportation for elderly people on a space-available basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 17849. A bill to provide financial assistance for and establishment of improved rail passenger service in the United States, to provide for the upgrading of rail roadbed and the modernization of rail passenger equipment, to encourage the development of new modes of high-speed ground transportation, to authorize the prescribing of minimum standards for railroad passenger service, to amend section 13(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 17850. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize reduced rate transportation for elderly people on a space-available basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WIDNALL (for himself, Mr. BROCK, Mr. CONABLE, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

H.J. Res. 1246. Joint resolution on wage and price stability; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. QUIE:

H. Con. Res. 648. Concurrent resolution providing that the Chief Justice of the United States be invited to address a joint session of Congress on the state of the judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 649. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the constitutional responsibility of the Congress of consultation with the President on matters affecting grave national issues of war and peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 650. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the question of the maintenance of the neutrality and territorial integrity of Cambodia and the human rights of the Cambodian people be referred to the Security Council of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H. Con. Res. 651. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a portion of U.S. Route 220 should be designated as part of the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H. Res. 1047. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the care of the aged in the United States and the effects of Federal laws and programs on the availability and quality of care; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H. Res. 1048. Resolution relative to consideration of the bill (H.R. 4249) to extend the Voting Rights Act of 1965; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 17851. A bill for the relief of Ludwig Kurz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKNEALLY:

H.R. 17852. A bill for the relief of Mirella Surian (nee Toffolutti) and Paolo Surian, her son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 17853. A bill for the relief of Carlo Bianchi and Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 17854. A bill for the relief of Jose Luis Dunn-Marin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H. Res. 1049. Resolution commemorating the 100th anniversary of Loyola University of Chicago; to the Committee on the Judiciary.