

Wren, Donald B. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wrinkle, Jack H. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wyatt, J. R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Yentz, Robert J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Yoder, Richard A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Yon, Versus A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Young, James A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Young, William H. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Zerbe, Franklin E. xxx-xx-xxxx

## CHAPLAINS

Buck, Wesley J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nelson, John F. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sandrock, Hans E. xxx-xx-xxxx

## DENTAL CORPS

Adkisson, Sam R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Askinas, Samuel W. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Best, Robert N. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cowe, Donald W. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Crosby, James F., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Devlyn, John E. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Metts, Dewey M., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Seamands, Charles W. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sherman, John R., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx

Smith, Richard A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stewart, Kenneth L. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Trovillion, Howard M. xxx-xx-xxxx

## MEDICAL CORPS

Anderson, Claude T. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Burwell, Robert R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cerha, Harry T. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cheeseman, Sumner A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Day, Richard T. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ford, Charles F. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Haworth, Wallace G. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kable, Kelvin D. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mitchell, Hugh R., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moritz, Henry C., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Perommer, John R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pollock, Clifford R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Powell, George W. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rehmar, Michael L. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reiner, Robert N. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shea, William H. H. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Spivey, Charles G., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tredici, Thomas J. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vanvranken, Eugene E. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Woosley, Homer E., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx

## NURSE CORPS

Hodgson, Maralfe R. xxx-xx-xxxx

## MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Baker, Wesley H. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Christiansen, Frank R. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Edmonds, Clarence W. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hannah, Ernest A. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rhodes, Stanley xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Robinson, Elvin, Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rochford, Edmund B., Sr. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rossi, Joseph P. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wolff, Francis F. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Zellers, Billy B. xxx-xx-xxxx

## VETERINARY CORPS

Barnes, Charles M. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reeves, Johnie L. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ringley, Donald W. xxx-xx-xxxx

## BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES CORPS

Cocheres, Thomas L. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gilbert, George F. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Morris, Floyd M. xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thompson, Ralph F. xxx-xx-xxxx

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, June 24, 1970

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

*And ye shall proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof.*—Leviticus 25: 10.

O God, our Father, in this sacred moment we would rise above the feverish activities of a seething world where we can be still and hear Thy voice seeking to guide us as we face the perplexing problems of this difficult day. During this hour of our national life, when the world's best hope for a bright tomorrow is largely in our frail hands, do Thou help us to preserve our heritage of freedom, to proclaim liberty to all the world, and to promote peace and good will among all people.

To this end bless our President, our Speaker, Members of Congress, and all who work with them that in this day of decision we may not lose the way.

"Cure Thy children's warring madness,  
 Bend our pride to Thy Control:  
 Shame our wanton, selfish gladness,  
 Rich in things and poor in soul,  
 Grant us wisdom, grant us courage,  
 Lest we miss Thy Kingdom's goal."  
 Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

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

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its Clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 743) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Touchet division, Walla Walla project, Oregon-Washington, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S.

2062) entitled "An act to provide for the differentiation between private and public ownership of lands in the administration of the acreage limitation provisions of Federal reclamation law, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2315. An act to restore the golden eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

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

S. 2209. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of North Dakota to the Central Dakota Nursing Home; and

S. 2583. An act to provide for the conveyance to the county of Washakie, State of Wyoming, of certain real property of the United States.

### TELEVISION FOR FIVE MILITARY HOSPITALS IN JAPAN

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to report to the House that Headquarters Pacific Air Forces—PACAF—has been requested to revalidate requirements for television at five military hospitals in Japan. The Air Force will have the responsibility for the service. The cost is \$424,000 and 10 military personnel will be required for the operation.

During a brief stop in Japan in August, I was surprised to note that there were no Armed Forces TV network facilities available in Japan. This is an important worldwide service which provides the best link for American forces overseas with our own country. It occurred to me at the time that there are no valid reasons that American forces in Japan should be denied this useful service.

Accordingly, I strongly urged upon my

return that the service be provided. It is now being done insofar as hospitals are concerned. It should be extended to all U.S. facilities in Japan.

### ANNUAL "DAY OF BREAD" AND "HARVEST FESTIVAL" WEEK IN OCTOBER

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

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, last year I joined with a number of my colleagues in sponsoring a resolution which established an annual "Day of Bread" and "Harvest Festival" week in October. The 1969 observances were proclaimed by the President, the Governors of 32 States, and 43 mayors.

Since 1953 West Germany has celebrated a "Day of Bread" with the custom spreading to other countries of the Continent, to the Americas, and the Far East.

"Day of Bread" as part of a "Harvest Festival" week is a time that we set aside as an expression of gratitude for the bounty of nature and recognition of bread as the symbol of all foods.

I am again joining in cosponsoring such a resolution that will set aside Tuesday, October 6, 1970, as a "Day of Bread," and designate the last week of October as the week of "Harvest Festival."

As governments around the world become increasingly concerned with the problems of feeding the hungry, this occasion will serve as a contribution to human understanding, person to person, and to international communication—to a degree that transcends all boundaries of country, creed, or politics.

### THE CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL GAME

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, we are now only hours away from the seventh con-

secutive Republican victory in the annual Roll Call congressional baseball game, and the eighth GOP victory in nine tries.

The success by my hardy band of athletes will be achieved despite the ill-conceived scheme of our opponents who, adopting the traditional ploy of the disenfranchised, will once again forsake action for criticism.

We can expect much howling from the Democratic dugout, and perhaps a filibuster or two with the umpires.

There will, however, be no "equal time provision" at the plate for the weak-hitting Democrats.

We will deal with their inflation of rhetoric by lowering our voices and raising our bats.

Our opponents will still try to get a piece of the action, but we can expect their Eastern Establishment Strategy to fall before our silent, but powerful majority of talented performers.

For victory, we will once again depend upon the Democrats adhering to the "no win" policy they have adopted so vehemently over the past 18 months. This policy, of course, followed a rather hawkish view of the game they had held during the previous 8 years.

Mr. Speaker, game time approaches. Rather than polarize sentiment about the contest, I want to urge all my colleagues to come out to the park tonight to see for themselves how the environmental-conscious Republicans can deal effectively with the air and noise pollution emanating from the Democratic sidelines.

#### EXTENDING EFFECTIVENESS OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950 TO JULY 30, 1970

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1259) to extend the effectiveness of the Defense Production Act of 1950 to July 30, 1970, and ask for immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Texas discussed this matter with me and with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL) yesterday. It was my understanding that the gentleman would wait until the gentleman from New Jersey was here to indicate on his own his approval of and concurrence with the action being suggested now by the gentleman from Texas.

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

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

Mr. PATMAN. May I state that he approves it. It was unanimously passed by our committee. Yesterday, when we conferred with the distinguished minority leader, he expressed the hope that it would be done. I can assure the gentleman that he is in accord with it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I do understand that the gentleman from New Jersey and the full Committee on Banking and Currency did recommend this action, but it would be more helpful if the gentleman were here from the Committee on Banking and Currency to speak for himself.

Mr. PATMAN. I assure the gentleman that he knew about it. We talked about it in the committee this morning. He knows about it. He has no objection. I am sure he assumed that would be sufficient, since he talked with the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I ask the gentleman this question: How long does this proposal recommend extension?

Mr. PATMAN. Thirty days only.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Thirty days?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Has it passed the other body?

Mr. PATMAN. No, sir. That is one of the reasons for it. They have reported it out of the committee but it has not been taken up in the other body.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. What is the expiration date of the existing law?

Mr. PATMAN. June 30.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, was there a quorum present in the Committee on Banking and Currency when approval was given for this resolution?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, yes. And the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL), also talked with the minority leader along with me.

Mr. GROSS. I just want to be sure there was a quorum present in the committee when the action was taken.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; there was. And if the gentleman had not been happy about it, I would not ask for its reconsideration.

Mr. GROSS. This is an extension of the Defense Production Act?

Mr. PATMAN. For 30 days only.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

H. J. RES. 1259

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

SECTION 1. Section 717(a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by striking out "June 30, 1970" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "July 30, 1970".

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### BURLEY TOBACCO ALLOTMENTS

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

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to permit the lease and transfer of burley tobacco al-

lotments. The purpose of this legislation is to afford the same treatment to burley farmers that farmers in other tobacco areas now enjoy.

Many of the burley growers in my district in North Carolina, as well as in other parts of the State, do not have the labor or the facilities to fulfill their tobacco allotments. My bill will allow these persons the opportunity to make money by leasing their allotments to other growers in the county.

While the details of the leasing arrangement must be agreed upon by both parties, the following qualifications must be met:

Both farmers must be in the same county.

The lease must be filed with and approved by the county Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee.

Only farmers who already have burley tobacco allotments will be eligible to lease other allotments.

The crop will be considered as having been produced on the farm from which the allotment is transferred. This is necessary to protect future allotments and referendum voting rights.

If the normal yield for the farm to which the allotment is being transferred exceeds by more than 10 percent the normal yield of the farm from which the transfer is being made, the allotment will be adjusted downward in the same ratio as the difference in yields.

No lease shall be entered into for any period in excess of 5 crop years.

Not more than 10 acres of allotment may be leased and transferred to any farmer.

I urge Congress to act favorably on this legislation as it will provide fair treatment to our burley growers, and will require no additional Federal funds to be enacted.

#### THE LATE COLONEL ROSCOE TURNER

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Nation lost one of its outstanding citizens, a hero who had served as a model of courage and daring to a generation of young people. Col. Roscoe Turner, pioneer in aviation during the 1920's and 1930's, spent his life in complete dedication to the development and progress of aeronautics, in which our country leads the rest of the world.

From very humble beginnings, he rose to worldwide fame through his sheer tenacity and a coolly calculated flamboyance in focusing the attention of the American people, by his exploits in the air, on the tremendous importance of aviation to the military strength and economic vigor we now enjoy. He was a three-time winner of national air races, the Bendix and the Thompson trophies. He helped to build and tested the first 300-mile-an-hour airplane produced in the United States. These are only a few of a multitude of achievements in the air, far beyond my ability to recount here.

Roscoe was no stranger to the Committee on Science and Astronautics. He served for several sessions of Congress as a consultant to the committee and allowed the members and staff to draw upon his great fund of knowledge in our efforts to expand and enlarge NASA's involvement in aeronautical research.

Roscoe Turner has not passed on to obscurity, because he was a man in the truest sense of heroic dimensions and accomplishments. He lived his last days as a legend which now passes on into history. I know that the members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House join with me in saluting Roscoe Turner and extending to his wife and his brother our most profound condolences.

#### THE LATE COLONEL ROSCOE TURNER

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

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to join with my dear friend and colleague, the chairman of the Science and Astronautics Committee (Mr. MILLER of California), in expressing my deep sorrow at the passing of a great American, Roscoe Turner.

I have known Roscoe over the past 25 years, and although I will not go into a recitation of his many accomplishments, as our chairman has already done today for the benefit of the House, however, I will say if I were to pick the greatest American I have ever known, without hesitation I would say Col. Roscoe Turner.

He was a neighbor of mine in Indiana, although he was born in Mississippi. For many years he made Indianapolis his home.

What he has given to the aviation industry and his contributions to the air transportation of Indiana, as well as to the industry throughout the Nation, are really so great, so numerous, that it is difficult to recite all of these accomplishments.

I last saw Roscoe Turner, here in Washington earlier this year; when he was here with our comrades of the American Legion. He was in great pain due to his illness. I took him to his hotel and helped him to his room. It was difficult for him to return to his room.

He was a patriotic, flag-loving American. His life has been devoted to his country. May this great man rest in peace.

I know I have lost a very dear personal friend. I know that this country has lost one of its greatest citizens.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I shall be glad to yield to my colleague from Mississippi.

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the remarks which have been made by the gentleman from Indiana and also by the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) with reference to the passing of Col. Roscoe Turner.

Mr. Speaker, I knew Roscoe Turner quite well. He was a native of Corinth, Miss., in the old First Congressional District that I represented for many years. He rendered distinguished service to his country and more especially to the aviation industry, and the sciences of aviation and astronautics.

He was a very great American and left behind a record of service and unusual accomplishment.

Mississippians all were very proud of Roscoe Turner and we deeply regret his passing.

#### URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1970

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to the House that the Committee on Banking and Currency has just completed action and reported unanimously the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1970. The committee by a vote of 34 to 0 has passed a far-reaching and much needed bill to provide \$5 billion for an expanded urban mass transportation program to meet the needs of both our small and large cities throughout this country. The bill that was reported out is essentially the same provision that the Subcommittee on Housing, of which I am chairman, approved for full committee action earlier this year. I am pleased that we have received splendid cooperation from the chairman of the full committee, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) and the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WINNALL), one of the long-time stalwart supporters of Federal assistance to urban mass transportation. I would also like to compliment all the Democratic members of the committee who provided strong support for the subcommittee passed bill, and also the members of the minority who aided in the passing of this strong legislation. We have received splendid cooperation from Secretary John Volpe of the Department of Transportation and his staff.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that once again the Congress has taken a leading step providing assistance for our urgently needed transportation needs. This was a bipartisan effort with the strong impetus from the Democratic leadership of Congress. I would hope that this bill can be brought to the House floor and passed very soon so that the President could sign this bill into law and begin to provide immediate assistance for transportation needs of all our cities.

#### LAST DITCH APPEAL FOR VOLUNTARY AGREEMENT ON JAPANESE TEXTILE IMPORTS TO PRECLUDE CONGRESSIONAL QUOTAS

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

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, as one

who comes from a textile State, I am most concerned over the last ditch appeal for a voluntary agreement on Japanese textile imports to preclude congressional quotas.

Only yesterday in my State of Alabama, I received a distressing call from a mayor of one of our small towns. Mr. Speaker, the one textile mill in this town is the very life blood of this community, where some 800 employees earn wages to support their families. This is an old mill, an established mill, having been in operation better than half a century and now they are literally on the ropes because of these damaging imports from Japan and other countries.

President Nixon has made his position clear on this matter—Secretary Stans has spent many days trying to reach an agreement with the Japanese Government and we must not be lulled into a false sense of security by further delays and piecemeal offers coming at the 11th hour.

The American textile industry cannot continue to absorb more than 4 billion yards of fabric coming into the United States annually without obviously closing many mills. This production is equivalent to the production of the 80 biggest mills in America and I strongly hope that this administration will elect to endorse and lend their wholehearted support to the textile quotas bill, offered by Chairman WILBUR MILLS and more than 250 other Members of Congress.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. 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. 185]

Abbitt	Dulski	Mollohan
Adair	Edwards, Ala.	Montgomery
Anderson,	Erlenborn	Murphy, N.Y.
Tenn.	Esch	O'Hara
Ashley	Farbstein	O'Neal, Ga.
Baring	Fish	O'Neill, Mass.
Biaggi	Ford,	Ottinger
Blackburn	William D.	Pike
Blanton	Gallagher	Podell
Blatnik	Gaydos	Pollock
Bow	Gilbert	Powell
Brasco	Gray	Reid, N.Y.
Brook	Green, Pa.	Relfel
Caffery	Halpern	Rivers
Carey	Hamilton	Robison
Celler	Hanna	Rooney, N.Y.
Chisholm	Hansen, Idaho	Roybal
Clancy	Hawkins	Scheuer
Clark	Hébert	Smith, Iowa
Clay	Jarman	Smith, N.Y.
Colmer	Keith	Staggers
Cramer	Kirwan	Stratton
Daddario	Leggett	Watson
Daniels, N.J.	Lowenstein	Welcker
Dawson	McCarthy	Wiggins
de la Garza	McCloskey	Wilson,
Dent	McEwen	Charles H.
Dickinson	McMillan	Young
Diggs	Meskill	
Dorn	Miller, Calif.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 344 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS,  
1971

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House on Thursday last, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1264) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1971, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

H.J. RES. 1264

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of the Government for the fiscal year 1971, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) (1) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities (not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution) which were conducted in the fiscal year 1970 and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority would be available in the following Appropriation Acts for the fiscal year 1971:

Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office Appropriation Act;  
Legislative Branch Appropriation Act;  
Office of Education Appropriation Act;  
Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriation Act;  
Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act;  
Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act;  
Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriation Act;  
Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriation Act;  
District of Columbia Appropriation Act;  
Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Act;  
Military Construction Appropriation Act; and

Public Works for Water, Pollution Control, and Power Development and Atomic Energy Commission Appropriation Act.

(2) Appropriations made by this subsection shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the pertinent appropriation Act.

(3) Whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted under an Act listed in this subsection as passed by the House is different from that which would be available or granted under such Act as passed by the Senate, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the lesser amount or the more restrictive authority.

(4) Whenever an Act listed in this subsection has been passed by only one House or where an item is included in only one version of an Act as passed by both Houses, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House, but at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the one House, whichever is lower: *Provided*, That no provision which is included in an appropriation Act enumerated in this subsection but which was not included in the

applicable appropriation Act for 1970, and which by its terms is applicable to more than one appropriation, fund, or authority shall be applicable to any appropriation, fund, or authority provided in this joint resolution unless such provision shall have been included in identical form in such bill as enacted by both the House and the Senate.

(b) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities which were conducted in the fiscal year 1970 and are listed in this subsection at a rate for operations not in excess of the current rate or the rate provided for in the budget estimate, whichever is lower, and under the more restrictive authority—

activities for which provision was made in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1970;

activities (not otherwise provided for in this joint resolution) for which provision was made in the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1970;

activities of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities;

activities relating to high-speed ground transportation research and development; activities of the Peace Corps; and activities of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission.

(c) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities for which disbursements are made by the Secretary of the Senate, and the Senate items under the Architect of the Capitol, to the extent and in the manner which would be provided for in the budget estimates for fiscal year 1971.

(d) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing the following activities, but at a rate for operations not in excess of the current rate—

activities of the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development;

coal mine health and safety activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

activities under the airport and airway trust fund.

SEC. 102. Appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall remain available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution, or (b) enactment of the applicable appropriation Act by both Houses without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) July 31, 1970, whichever first occurs.

SEC. 103. Appropriations and funds made available or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in subsection (d)(2) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, but nothing herein shall be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds or to permit the use, including the expenditure, of appropriations, funds, or authority in any manner which would contravene the provisions of title V of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1970.

SEC. 104. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 105. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 106. No appropriation or fund made available or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be used to initiate

or resume any project or activity which was not being conducted during the fiscal year 1970.

SEC. 107. Any appropriation for the fiscal year 1971 required to be apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, may be apportioned on a basis such increases cannot be absorbed within available appropriations) for a supplemental or deficiency estimate of appropriation to the extent necessary to permit payment of such pay increases as may be granted pursuant to law to civilian officers and employees and to active and retired military personnel. Each such appropriation shall otherwise be subject to the requirements of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

Mr. MAHON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the joint resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, if the Public Works Appropriation Bill for 1971 passes the House today as expected, the House will have passed all of the regular annual appropriation bills for fiscal 1971 except the Labor-HEW bill and the defense appropriation bill.

The defense appropriation bill lacks finalization of the annual authorization for major procurement and research and development and thus will not be brought up for some time.

The Labor-HEW bill is expected to be reported in the early part of July. Of course, as Members know, the education programs have been separately handled in a bill passed by the House on April 14.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to enable the various departments and agencies of Government to continue to operate during the month of July pending final enactment of the regular annual appropriations for the year that begins on July 1. This is the standard procedure in the absence of enactment of the regular bills by July 1. There is nothing unique about it; the House has approved this type of resolution on many occasions.

The resolution is limited to the month of July. We are hopeful that a number of the appropriation bills for 1971 can be sent to the President before July 31. The committee in the other body seems to be in position to make this possible. I am advised that hearings are complete on a number of the bills. Some bills have been reported. Others, I understand, are being readied for reporting. And the other body has begun debating the bills that have been reported.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the pending resolution.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the chairman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the comments made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON). I know of no objection to this resolution on this side of the aisle. We recognize the necessity of it. We have already passed in this body 11 of the 14 appro-

priation bills. We will adopt another this afternoon. But while we wait on the adoption and the passage of all of these bills the Government has to continue to function and continue to pay its bills, and this is the only way that can be accomplished.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Texas what the situation is with respect to the authorization bills, if the gentleman has that information at hand. How many authorization bills are still outstanding?

Mr. MAHON. The major annual authorization bill remaining outstanding is for about \$25 billion for military procurement and research and development. This bill passed the House quite some time ago, but has not been considered by the other body, and that is the main reason for the delay on the defense appropriations bill.

Mr. GROSS. Are there any authorization bills that have not come before the House?

Mr. MAHON. There are other authorization bills that have not been finally enacted into law, but so far as I know there will be no problem from the standpoint of processing the appropriations in the House. Where necessary, we have adopted in the House rules waiving points of order. The only major remaining authorization bill that is causing us any delay is on defense.

Mr. GROSS. Is what?

Mr. MAHON. Is the defense authorization bill.

Mr. GROSS. I see.

But all authorizations for appropriations have been passed by the House at this point; is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. Generally speaking, I believe that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And there are two appropriation bills, two major appropriation bills, outstanding?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. With the passage of the public works appropriation bill today, will there still be two bills outstanding?

Mr. MAHON. There will be two bills. We have passed the education part of the HEW bill, and it is being considered at this time in the other body. So, we have yet to report to the House a portion of the Labor-HEW bill, and the defense bill.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. We expect to report the Labor-HEW bill in the first half of July. We are in an excellent position in the House on the matter of reporting the bills.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the House will take some assurance from the fact that the defense appropriation bill is ready for markup. We concluded our hearings some time ago. We are simply waiting on the authorization.

I would like to again remind the House that, for the first time in a number of

years, the Committee on Appropriations has substantially completed all of its work insofar as the House is concerned, and insofar as the committees are concerned prior to the beginning of the fiscal year. That has meant a great deal of work, and it is something that the House should be pleased to recognize.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

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

#### EXCERPTS FROM REPORT ON CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I am including extensive excerpts from the report of the committee on the pending continuing resolution. Virtually the entire Government will be operating to one degree or another under this resolution—assuming it is enacted and signed into law—beginning July 1. So it is an important piece of legislation, and I believe it would be desirable to have the record show something of the details about the resolution and the status of the appropriations bills.

The following are excerpts from the committee report, filed on June 18:

#### CONCEPT AND TIME PERIOD OF THE RESOLUTION

The resolution follows the basic form and concept of similar resolutions of past years. Last year's initial continuing resolution—for fiscal 1970—became Public Law 91-33, approved June 30, 1969.

The time period covered by the accompanying resolution is the month of July 1970. Judged by comparison with some earlier years this is a very limited time extension of funding authority for the new fiscal year, but it is not inconsistent with the generally accelerated schedule of processing

the appropriation bills that has thus far been followed by the Committee on Appropriations and the House. A great deal of the appropriations business for fiscal 1971 can be legislatively finalized during the next several weeks, depending significantly on the actions of the other body.

Of course, any appropriations business that may be pending final legislative disposition when this continuing resolution expires would require consideration of an extension of the resolution.

#### STATUS OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS

All but two of the fourteen annual appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1971 have been reported to the House and will have been sent to the other body before the new fiscal year begins.

Hearings on the Labor-HEW appropriation bill have been completed, but there has been some slippage from the original schedule for it, largely because of extra time required to finalize the fiscal 1970 Labor-HEW appropriations and the decision to have a separate bill for education appropriations. The Labor-HEW bill for 1971 is now expected to be ready for House floor action shortly after the July Fourth break.

Hearings on the Defense appropriation bill were completed on schedule last month, and, but for complications stemming from lack of more definitive action on the legislative authorization underlying major procurement and research and development programs, would have been reported to the House about as originally scheduled.

Of the 12 appropriation bills for 1971 processed by the Committee on Appropriations in substantial accord with the tentative schedule announced on March 17, three were passed by the House by mid-April; four during May; two on June 4; one on June 9; and one on June 11. The Public Works-AEC bill is scheduled for the House floor next week.

Following is a tabulation of the bills:

#### THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION BILLS FOR 1971—IN THE HOUSE

Bill	Reported	Passed	Notes
1. Legislative	Apr 9	Apr 13	
2. Treasury-Post Office	do	do	
3. Education	do	Apr 14	
4. Independent offices—HUD	May 7	May 12	Annual authorizations for NASA and NSF not finally enacted when considered.
5. State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary	May 12	May 14	Authorizations for law enforcement assistance, Economic Development Administration and several other items not finally enacted when considered.
6. Interior	May 14	May 19	Authorizations for some relatively minor items not finally enacted when considered.
7. Transportation	May 21	May 27	Authorization for high-speed ground transportation research and development not finally enacted when considered.
8. District of Columbia	June 1	June 4	Additional revenue legislation not reported.
9. Foreign assistance	do	do	Authorization for Peace Corps and foreign military sales not finally enacted when considered.
10. Agriculture	June 4	June 9	Authorization for food stamp and special milk programs not finally enacted when considered.
11. Military construction	June 8	June 11	Authorization not finally enacted when considered.
12. Public works-AEC	June 18	(?)	
13. Labor-HEW	(?)	(?)	Authorization action needed for a few items.
14. Defense	(?)	(?)	Authorization for procurement and R. & D. not finally enacted.

<sup>1</sup> Scheduled for floor action next week.

<sup>2</sup> See comments above.

#### DETAILS ABOUT THE RESOLUTION

Comporting with continuing resolutions over a period of many years, the emphasis in the resolution is on the continuation of existing projects and activities at the lowest of one of three rates, namely, the current (fiscal year 1970) rate; the budget request for 1971 where no action has been taken by either House; or the more restrictive amount adopted by either of the two Houses. The whole thrust of the resolution is to keep the Government functioning on a minimum basis until funds for the full year are otherwise determined upon.

The general basis of operation is this:

If the applicable 1971 appropriation bill has passed both Houses but not cleared con-

ference, and the particular amount of authority therein differs, the pertinent project or activity continues under the lesser of the two amounts and under the more restrictive authority.

Where a bill has passed only one House, or where an appropriation for a project or activity is included in only one version of a bill as passed by both Houses, the pertinent project or activity continues under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House, but at a rate for operations not exceeding the current fiscal year 1970 rate or the rate permitted by the one House, whichever is the lower.

Where neither House has passed the applicable appropriation bill for the fiscal year

1971—and that is the case with only 2 of the 14 scheduled annual bills for 1971—appropriations are provided for continuing projects or activities conducted during fiscal year 1970 at the current rate or the rate provided for in the budget estimate for 1971, whichever is lower, and under the more restrictive authority. If there is no budget estimate, special provision is made for continuation until the question is disposed of in the course of processing the applicable regular bill.

The resolution does not in any way augment the appropriation for a given project or activity in the regular bills for the fiscal year 1971. In the words of section 105 of the resolution itself:

"Sec. 105. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law."

In other words, while this resolution—as in the case of similar resolutions of previous years—does not enumerate specific amounts that may be obligated and expended for the countless activities of government during the period of the resolution (or such shorter period as the resolution may operate as to particular departments or agencies), the controlling factor, known to all who have any responsibility for the management of the programs or the obligation of the funds, is that whatever is used during this interim must be taken out of, or charged against, whatever amount is finally appropriated, or otherwise made available, for the whole year.

Section 101(b) and following subsections of that section of the resolution are drawn along the conventional lines of similar past resolutions and, generally, encompass those activities to be considered in connection with appropriation bills not yet reported from the Committee or which are otherwise not presently included in a bill.

Section 102 provides that the resolution ceases to apply to an agency or activity concurrent with approval by the President of the applicable appropriation bill in which provision for such agency or activity is made. Thus the scope of the continuing resolution constricts as each bill is enacted; the resolution will be wholly inoperative after the last bill for 1971 is approved, or July 31, whichever first occurs.

Section 104 is standard in continuing resolutions, and is self-explanatory.

Section 106 is also standard in continuing resolutions, forbidding the use of funds provided in the joint resolution to initiate any new project or activity or to resume any which was not being conducted in fiscal 1970.

Common, of course, to all appropriations and funds that are used in 1971 for payment of salaries of civilian and military personnel will be the extra compensation that must be paid as a result of the general 6% pay increase granted several weeks ago to civilian and military personnel pursuant to law. There is no administrative discretion in the matter of the extra payments to personnel. The line-item budget estimates for 1971 did not make specific allowance for these added costs, causing the committee to include, as Section 107 of the resolution, a provision authorizing deficiency apportionments for 1971 to the extent any such pay increases cannot be absorbed within funds otherwise available.

EXPENDITURE CEILING PROVISION

Title V of the pending second supplemental appropriation bill, 1970, deals with the matter of a ceiling on outlays (expenditures and net lending) for fiscal 1971. Any reductions that may be an outgrowth of whatever is enacted in this connection introduces something of an extra dimension to budgets of the departments and agencies of government in the fiscal year 1971 beginning on July 1 next, casting something of

a shadow over not only the unexpended carryover balances in innumerable accounts across the government but also over many of the specific appropriation and fund amounts now pending consideration at various stages in the legislative process.

In this general connection, Section 103 of the joint resolution follows the stereotyped form of previous continuing resolutions in waiving the time periods set forth in 31 U.S.C. 665(d) (2) for the submission and approval of papers on the apportionments of funds. This in nowise waives the basic requirement in the law for the apportionment of funds over the year but merely dispenses with considerable paper work that as a practical matter cannot be usefully applied to temporary appropriation provisions. But in view of the pending ceiling provisions of such title V applicable to fiscal 1971, the committee has attached to section 103 a proviso that—"nothing herein shall be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds or to permit the use, including the expenditure, of appropriations, funds, or authority in any manner which would contravene the provisions of title V of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1970."

The basic law (31 U.S.C. 665) on apportionment of funds reads, in pertinent parts, as follows:

"(c) (1) \* \* \* all appropriations or funds available for obligation for a definite period of time shall be so apportioned as to prevent obligation or expenditure thereof in a manner which would indicate a necessity for deficiency or supplemental appropriations for such period; and all appropriations of funds not limited to a definite period of time, and all authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations, shall be so apportioned as to achieve the most effective and economical use thereof. As used hereafter in this section, the term "appropriation" means appropriations, funds, and authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations.

"(3) Any appropriation subject to apportionment shall be distributed by months, calendar quarters, operating seasons, or other time periods, or by activities, functions, projects, or objects, or by a combination thereof, as may be deemed appropriate by the officers designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments. \* \* \*"

THE APPROPRIATIONS BUSINESS OF THE SESSION  
Fiscals 1970-72—House Totals

In the appropriation bills of the session, encompassing the bills for fiscal 1971 (including the Public Works-AEC bill for 1971 as reported), the second supplemental bill for 1970, and a couple of advance funding items for fiscal 1972, the House has considered budget requests for new budget (obligational) authority of \$56,681,392,953.

Against these requests, the Committee on Appropriations recommended a total of \$54,559,261,608, a net reduction of \$2,122,131,345. Floor changes added a net total of \$351,027,000, making the revised amount approved \$54,910,288,608, or \$1,771,104,345, net, below the related budget requests.

Fiscal 1971—House Totals

Dealing only with fiscal 1971 amounts, and including the Public Works-AEC bill as reported, budget requests considered in connection with the 12 bills to date aggregate \$49,236,258,822, against which the Committee on Appropriations recommended \$48,649,145,817, a net reduction of \$587,113,005.

Not counting the Public Works-AEC bill on which the House itself has not yet acted, the House approved six of the bills without money change; reduced two of them; and increased three of them. In total, House floor changes added \$347,027,000 to the committee totals:

\$350,000,000 was added for basic water and sewer grants under the Department of HUD. \$80,000,000 was deleted from the Foreign Assistance bill when the Peace Corps was knocked out on a point of order.

\$44,000,000 was added for rural water and waste disposal grants under the Farmers Home Administration.

\$25,000,000 was added for medical care in the Veterans Administration.

\$8,400,000 was added for the Coast Guard Reserve.

\$373,000 was deleted from the Interior bill when the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission was knocked out on a point of order.

Thus, in the 12 bills for fiscal 1971 including Public Works-AEC bill as reported—and as to fiscal 1971 amounts only—the House made a net reduction of \$240,086,005 in the new budget (obligational authority) requests.

Effect of House actions on budgeted expenditures (outlays)

Since the budget requests and the bills are stated on the basis of "new budget authority" it is of course easy to report comparisons of congressional actions on this basis. But for several reasons it is virtually impossible to make a precise translation of the effects of those actions on the budget estimates (not "requests") of 1971 outlays (expenditures and net lending). There are several imponderables not within the scope of the bills that can and do affect expenditure (disbursement) rates and timing. Carryover balances are involved. Uncertainties of deliveries; unforceable administrative changes; construction schedule changes; lag of expenditures behind obligations for various research and other grants; and so on. All that can be done is to undertake reasonable approximations of the expenditure reductions.

Specifically, as to House actions in the 12 appropriation bills for 1971—again, including the Public Works-AEC bill as reported:

1. \$240,086,005 has been cut from new budget (obligational) authority requests.

2. Based on tentative approximations, these would translate into net reductions of \$127,700,000 from the projected budget expenditures (outlays) for 1971. (Note.—In addition, the Second Supplemental Bill, 1970 may have some impact, but this might be offset by slippage of time so as to throw some budgeted 1970 expenditures into 1971.)

For general reference purposes of Members and others, it may be of interest to again call attention to the periodic budget "score-keeping" reports issued by the staff of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures. Those reports are designed to keep tabs, currently, on what is happening in the legislative process to the budget recommendations of the President, both appropriation-wise and expenditure-wise, and on the revenue recommendations, and not only from actions in the revenue and appropriation bills but also in legislative bills that affect budget authority and expenditures (backdoor bills, bills that mandate expenditures, and so on).

Several such reports have been issued this year, and another is due shortly.

Fiscal 1972—House totals

Budget requests for advance funding for fiscal 1972 were considered and disposed of in the House as follows:

	Budget	Allowed
Education bill (elementary and secondary education).....	\$1,339,050,000	.....
Transportation bill (District of Columbia subway construction).....	188,011,000	\$150,000,000
Total, 1972 advance funding.....	1,527,061,000	150,000,000

*Fiscal 1971 amounts pending in House committee*

Budget requests for new budget (obligational) authority for fiscal 1971 are now pending before the committee in connection with the Labor-HEW and Defense appropriation bills, as follows:

Labor-HEW	\$18,731,737,000
Defense	68,745,666,000
Total	87,477,403,000

SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATION BILL TOTALS OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY, 91ST CONG., 2D SESS., AS OF JUNE 18, 1970 (BUT SUBSEQUENT TO MAR. 5)

[Does not include any "back-door" type budget authority; or any permanent (Federal or trust) authority, under earlier or "permanent" law,<sup>1</sup> without further or annual action by the Congress]

	New budget (obligational) authority. (All figures are slightly rounded.)		
	Bills for fiscal 1970	Bills for fiscal 1971	Bills for the session
<b>A. House actions:</b>			
1. Budget requests considered	\$5,918,073,000	\$50,763,320,000	\$56,681,393,000
2. Amounts approved by House	5,764,116,000	49,146,173,000	54,910,289,000
3. Comparisons with corresponding budget requests	-153,957,000	-1,617,147,000	-1,771,104,000
<b>B. Senate actions:</b>			
1. Budget requests considered			
2. Amounts approved by Senate			
3. Comparison with corresponding budget requests			
4. Comparison with House amounts in same bills			
<b>C. Enacted:</b>			
1. Budget requests considered			
2. Amounts enacted			
3. Comparison with corresponding budget requests			

<sup>1</sup> The budget for 1971, as submitted Feb. 2, tentatively estimated total new budget authority for 1971 at \$234,800,000,000 (\$218,000,000,000, net of certain budget presentation adjustments) of which \$148,100,000,000 was for action by Congress and \$86,700,000,000 would become available under permanent law.

<sup>2</sup> Includes request of \$1,527,061,000 advance funding for fiscal year 1972.  
<sup>3</sup> Includes \$150,000,000 advance funding for fiscal year 1972. Also includes public works-AEC bill as reported by committee.  
<sup>4</sup> Of which \$1,377,061,000 represents disallowance of fiscal 1972 advance funding requests, and \$240,086,000 relates to fiscal 1971 requests.

Note: House actions on bills for 1971 are tentatively estimated to decrease outlays (expenditures) by approximately \$127,700,000 (including \$64,000,000 related to floor point of order).

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.  
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and insert certain pertinent material and also that other Members may revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR HOUSE MANAGERS TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 17399, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the supplemental appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1970 which ends next week is in conference between the House and Senate today. I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a conference report on the bill,

Senate actions

The Committee in the other body has reported the Second Supplemental appropriation bill for 1970, the Office of Education appropriation bill for 1971 and the District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1971.

Summary of bill totals to date

A summary of totals of new budget (obligational) authority on appropriation measures for fiscals 1970 and 1971 to date follows:

New budget (obligational) authority. (All figures are slightly rounded.)

	Bills for fiscal 1970	Bills for fiscal 1971	Bills for the session
1. Budget requests considered	\$5,918,073,000	\$50,763,320,000	\$56,681,393,000
2. Amounts approved by House	5,764,116,000	49,146,173,000	54,910,289,000
3. Comparisons with corresponding budget requests	-153,957,000	-1,617,147,000	-1,771,104,000

A. House actions:

1. Budget requests considered  
 2. Amounts approved by House  
 3. Comparisons with corresponding budget requests

B. Senate actions:

1. Budget requests considered  
 2. Amounts approved by Senate  
 3. Comparison with corresponding budget requests  
 4. Comparison with House amounts in same bills

C. Enacted:

1. Budget requests considered  
 2. Amounts enacted  
 3. Comparison with corresponding budget requests

H.R. 17399, the supplemental appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 18127) making appropriations for public works for water, pollution control, and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Panama Canal, the Federal Water Quality Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 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 Arizona (Mr. RHODES), and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

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. 18127, with Mr. ASPINALL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, we bring you today the public works for water, pollution control, and power development and Atomic Energy Commission appropriations bill for 1971.

This is a big bill—a major bill—a significant bill.

This is an all-America bill and represents an investment in the future of America.

This bill reflects the concern of the Congress in the future of America—in the development of our water resources for the benefit of our people—in the protection of our water and environment against pollution—in the providing of needed electric power for an expanding population—in the defense of our Nation by maintaining our nuclear strength—and in the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy in the national interest rather than for the benefit of special interests.

At the outset I want to say that we continue to miss our distinguished and beloved chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN.

TRIBUTE TO MIKE KIRWAN

I regret to report that MIKE's condition is not as encouraging as we would hope. Although he continues to be in good spirits, his general condition is not promising. We all miss him. We miss his great leadership and commitment for progress through internal improvements—the great force of his leadership for growth and development of our Nation.

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

I know that I speak for all of us when I say that we shall always wish him well.

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

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I have asked my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Tennessee, to yield for the purpose of concurring in the remarks he has made about our great chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN.

When the gentleman from Tennessee says that he speaks for every Member of the House and that his sentiments are shared by every Member, I know that he speaks correctly. Certainly, the Members on this side of the aisle have as much regard for MIKE KIRWAN as do the Members on the other side. We wish him the best of everything in the future and thank him for the great services he has rendered to the House of Representatives and to our country in his great career as a Member of this body.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Chairman, all members of our subcommittee have contributed to the preparation of this bill—all have participated.

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

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

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

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

I particularly recommend your reading the sections relating to the emphasis on the environment—and action being taken to abate pollution and to regulate and control nuclear radiation hazards.

#### OVERALL SUMMARY

By way of overall summary, the President's budget recommended \$5,269,181,000 for public works, AEC, and water pollution control for 1971.

We are recommending in the bill for next year \$5,242,556,000—a cut and reduction of \$26,625,000 from the budget request.

The largest item in the bill is for programs of the Atomic Energy Commission—\$2,325,600,000.

We have made cuts and reductions in the AEC budget of \$37,400,000—including a reduction of \$45,400,000 in operating expenses. We have increased the plant and capital equipment item by \$8 million, making a net cut and reduction of \$37,400,000 from the budget.

One of the most important actions by the committee was the removal of \$300,000 recommended in the President's budget to establish and set up a separate "corporate directorate" within the AEC to operate the AEC's uranium enrichment facilities.

The committee concurred with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in deleting this \$300,000—and further in

appropriating \$16.1 million to initiate improvements at the gaseous diffusion plants to increase the capacity of these plants to meet projected requirements for civilian power reactors.

These gaseous diffusion plants, owned by the Government, are located in Oak Ridge, Tenn., Paducah, Ky., and Portsmouth, Ohio. They are the key to providing the supply of fuel for nuclear electrical production—and the key to the cost of this fuel to the people.

The committee believes that an adequate justification was not made for setting up a separate directorate to be superimposed on the AEC management structure—with increased cost and expenses.

The committee believes further—as stated in the report—that the present AEC organization is conducting the management of the plant operations in a most efficient and effective manner.

Much of the emphasis in our report is on the impact of the programs and projects funded in this bill to improve the quality of our environment.

We are providing more than a billion and a half dollars in appropriations to help improve the environment. A breakdown of these funds appears on page 5 of the committee's report.

The research and development, pollution control grants, and Federal water resources construction funded in this bill will produce a wide range of benefits which contribute directly to the goals of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

Another important national goal and objective relevant to this bill is the production of sufficient electric power to serve the needs of the Nation.

The water resource projects of the Corps of Engineers, Tennessee Valley Authority, Bureau of Reclamation, and Bonneville Power Administration, among others, funded in this bill are indispensable links in the chain of electric power production which girds our Nation.

We have also emphasized the importance of the development of nuclear electric power for the future.

#### CORPS OF ENGINEERS

For programs of the Corps of Engineers, the committee recommends \$1,262,176,000 in new budget obligational authority for 1971.

This is \$3,797,000 less than the budget estimate.

For construction the committee recommends \$825,689,000.

This is \$4,291,000 over the budget estimate.

While making some increases, we have made cuts and reductions in other items in the bill, which brings the total overall amount below the budget as indicated earlier.

Over the years there has been slowdown, stretchout, and cutback, resulting in a huge backlog of essentially needed projects.

As a general policy the committee has given first priority to funding projects of the Corps of Engineers which have previously been approved for planning, land

acquisition, or construction—projects funded in last year's bill but which were placed under the budget freeze order.

Increases generally have been provided for these projects to keep abreast of corps capability and return to the original completion schedule.

Committee increases for this purpose involve 51 projects with a total of \$15.2 million.

The committee has limited unbudgeted new starts to a small number of projects primarily involving water supply, water quality, and local flood protection.

A total of only \$27.9 million has been allowed for 35 new construction starts in the Corps of Engineers appropriation—including \$15.9 million for 16 new starts requested in the budget estimate.

The committee is recommending 47 projects for studies, 18 projects for planning, and two projects for land acquisition.

#### ASSESSMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

In view of the continuing budgetary limitations and stringency in water resource projects, it is interesting to note the latest assessment of the Nation's water resources.

In this assessment—and I direct your attention to page 12 of the report—the Water Resources Council estimates that projected capital outlays totaling \$20 billion for the 5-year period 1969-73 will be required for waste treatment facilities, sanitary sewers, and water cooling requirements.

Requirements for municipal water systems are expected to triple by 2020.

Requirements for industrial use are expected to increase more than 300 percent.

And requirements for fresh water for steam-electric power are expected to multiply more than six times.

The potential for flood damage is expected to triple by the turn of the century.

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

In view of this great need and demand for water resource projects, the committee feels its request for only 35 new starts is indeed modest.

Despite this great need it is interesting to note that continued slowdowns and unfunding of authorized studies and projects have resulted in a backlog of 738 projects—listed under the categories of—

Studies, not started—330.

Planning, not started—169.

Planning, underway—127.

Planning completed, construction not started—112.

These 738 studies and projects involve \$9,710,687,000. We have almost a \$10 billion backlog in public works projects and the amount is increasing every year.

We have been providing for some 50 to 65 new construction starts each year for the past several years. At this rate we will be a long time in catching up with the large backlog.

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

This year the committee is recommending 35 starts—far less than the need.

#### PROJECT BENEFITS

It is also interesting to note the benefits that have been derived from completed projects for pollution control, water supply, power development, flood control, navigation, reclamation, and recreation.

The Federal Government has made 10,000 grants totaling \$1.6 billion for water pollution control—and these facilities now serve some 78 million Americans.

Water stored in Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs provide more than 2½ billion gallons of municipal and industrial water to about 18 million people annually.

Power benefits from TVA, Bureau of Reclamation, and Corps of Engineers hydroelectric projects produce 185.2 billion kilowatt-hours.

Flood control by these multipurpose projects prevented an estimated \$20,-244,000,000 in damages—at a cost to the Federal Government of less than \$6½ billion.

The navigation system of harbors and waterways built by the Corps of Engineers now carry almost 1½ billion tons of traffic annually.

The Bureau of Reclamation irrigation projects now irrigate about 9 million acres producing crops valued at almost \$2 billion annually.

This is the record of accomplishments and achievements of the Federal water resources program—an all-American program for all Americans.

#### GRANTS FOR WASTE TREATMENT WORKS

Concerning the vital and important matter of assuring clean water through antipollution measures, the committee is recommending a direct appropriation of \$1 billion for the funding of grants to States for construction of waste treatment works—as authorized by the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966.

This \$1 billion—together with a carry-over balance of \$440 million—will provide a total of \$1,440,000,000 available for grants for next year, compared with an authorization of \$1,250,000,000.

The committee is recommending this direct appropriation, although the 1971 budget submission proposed new legislation to provide contract authority of \$4 billion for 4 years—a billion dollars a year over the next 4 years.

Rather than risk a slowdown in the program, as this new legislation has not been approved, the committee voted for a further direct appropriation.

There can be no question but that new legislation is needed with respect to revising the formula for distribution of the grant funds to the States.

Under the present formula which allocates funds to the States on the basis of population rather than need, about half the States receive more than they can utilize and many States receive far less than needed.

The funds do not reach some major pollution problem areas under present legislation.

Further complicating the problem is

the fact that funds, not used, cannot be reallocated for a period of 18 months. As a result, as of April 30 last, more than \$607 million remains unallocated out of the \$865 million available for grants at the beginning of the fiscal year.

Although the committee is limited in measures it can take through the appropriations process to alleviate this situation—which obviously requires legislation—the committee is recommending this:

That of the \$1 billion in new appropriations, \$800 million be allocated through the present formula.

That the remaining \$200 million be allocated on the basis of the eligibility of certain States to receive reimbursements for projects already funded by the States and local governments under section (c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

The committee has also added language providing that grant funds not allocated at the end of the fiscal year be subject to reallocation.

These are interim, makeshift measures—the proper legislative committees will, I am sure, proceed with legislation to establish a more equitable basis of allocation, based primarily on need.

#### ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

For the Atomic Energy Commission the committee is recommending \$2,325,600,000—a cut and reduction of \$37,400,000 from the budget request of \$2,363,000,000.

As I indicated earlier, the committee is recommending against any funding of the proposed “corporate directorate” which the administration recommends to begin the process of sale of the gaseous diffusion plants to private interests.

We do not consider this directorate or the sale of these important plants to be in the national interest.

The Atomic Energy Commission is managing these plants in a competent, capable, efficient manner and the public interest requires that these plants remain publicly owned and controlled by the Government.

In assessing the importance and the investment in these assets, the committee is recommending \$16.1 million for improvements and modifications of these plants, in anticipation of increased demands for enriched uranium, as fuel for nuclear-powered electric powerplants.

It is the committee's considered judgment that these nuclear powerplants have the greatest potential as an alternative source of power to assist in solving the energy problems facing the Nation.

It has been estimated that within 30 years nuclear plants will be providing half of the Nation's total electric power generating capacity.

It is obvious, therefore, that ownership of these plants and control of the prices and rates should remain in public ownership rather than being sold to private interests.

The committee has also taken cognizance of the concern and of reports of the possibility of radiation from nuclear powerplants.

The committee notes that the safety record of the Atomic Energy Commission is second to none.

Much testimony was received by the committee from officials of the Atomic Energy Commission on this subject—on all that is being done to minimize and eliminate and protect the public from the hazards of radioactivity from nuclear powerplants. The Commission is stepping up its inspection and regulatory work in this field and I commend and congratulate the Atomic Energy Commission for the great work it is doing in this area in the public interest.

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to point out—and I believe Members and others will be interested in this—that we had testimony that one would likely receive more radiation from a flight from New York to California in an airplane than one would receive standing by a nuclear powerplant for a year. We do not oppose flights, but we say that the exposure to radiation would be greater on such a flight than from standing by a nuclear powerplant for a year.

The testimony also indicates that one would get more radiation from a dental X-ray or from a chest X-ray than one would get in living near a nuclear power plant for several years.

So the fear about radiation is alarming, but it is all out of proportion. It is not realistic, according to the expert testimony. Our report tries to set this in proper perspective.

We must have advancement of nuclear power for defense purposes and also for peaceful purposes.

Mr. Chairman, to summarize—we have provided in this bill for a modest number of new starts—35, in total—in water resource projects—although the backlog of needed projects continues to snowball.

We believe our request is prudent and reasonable—in view of the large backlog of 738 projects, approved by Congress—as needed in the public interest.

We have also provided for \$1 billion for next year for grants to the States for construction of waste treatment facilities.

Next year we will be spending over \$2½ billion, carried in this bill for work on improvement of the environment. We have devoted much of our report to the application of these programs and projects to the preservation of our environment.

We have acted in the public interest in moving to assure that the gaseous diffusion plants of the Atomic Energy Commission—the primary source of nuclear powerplants to provide electricity—will remain in public ownership in the national interest.

I repeat, this is a good bill—an all-American bill—an investment in the future growth and progress of America.

This bill is a window through which we can glimpse of the future of America—an America free of pollution—an America with abundant electric power—an America with a vast network of inland waterways and with recreation facilities unlimited—a stronger and better America of tomorrow.

I urge approval of this vital appropriations bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, again I wish to pay my respects to the members of the subcommittee, who have labored long and hard in preparing this bill. We have labored without the guidance and the presence of our great chairman, the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, and it has not been an easy task to do this job without him.

I want particularly to voice my own respect and gratitude to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS) for the fine work which they have done in chairing the subcommittee and in filling in for Mr. KIRWAN. Equally deserving of praise for their fine work are my Republican colleagues, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON).

As has always occurred since I have been on this subcommittee, we have had a maximum of harmony and a minimum of dissent. The bill which we bring to the floor today has the unanimous approval of all of the members of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, this, in my opinion, is as good a bill as this subcommittee has ever brought to the floor of the House. It recognizes a number of changes which have come about in this country during the past few years. All are aware that the environment and the ecology of this country are an issue that has now become the thought and conscious concern of every responsible citizen. You will note from our report that the committee is also very much concerned about the environment in which we live, particularly zealous in trying to protect that environment from further encroachment, and anxious to heal the wounds which it has suffered from ill use in the past.

The first 14 pages of the report, Mr. Chairman, are almost completely concerned with discussions of the environment and its problems. We have carefully studied the possibility that current and future activities of the Atomic Energy Commission might adversely affect the environment.

We point out the commendable effort of the Atomic Energy Commission to limit and, if possible, completely eliminate this potential problem. We also discuss the efforts made to avoid water pollution in the future, and to clean our streams, rivers, and lakes from the pollution of the past.

As mentioned by the gentleman from Tennessee, there is approximately \$2 billion in this bill to clean up our existing water resources and to provide for water of a better quality in the future.

In addition to this, of course, there are many other benefits we receive from water development. These include the recreational facilities that are provided and the fact that much of our water conservation effort also results in improved supplies of clean water for many of our cities and towns.

I do think it is necessary to mention that there will always be pollution potential in the production of electric power until we are able to resolve certain problems concerned with the use of the thermonuclear reactor. I do not intend to minimize or decry the significant strides which have been made by science and technology in taking the ash, the solid waste, out of the smoke which comes from the burning of coal. Substantial efforts have also been made to lessen the amount of sulfur dioxide released in the air from coal fueled electric power production. And certainly one must respect the scientific and physical changes which have evolved from the study and operation of our existing nuclear reactors. These produce great quantities of electric power and are as safe as they can possibly be made.

But, in all candor, it is still necessary to state that certain pollutants occur from the production of electricity by fossil fueled nuclear plants and nuclear power itself. We have the problem of thermal pollution which occurs, because of the necessity to use great quantities of water to cool the reactor. It is a fact of life that when water used for cooling is returned into the stream or lake from which it is drawn, that it will probably raise the temperature of those streams and lakes. It is also true that raising the temperature does affect the ecology—the plant and marine life contained in those particular bodies of water.

This, Mr. Chairman, is why many of us believe that a controlled thermonuclear reactor offers the greatest potential source of energy and represents the best long-term solution to most of our power and conservation problems.

Putting it briefly and succinctly, the control of nuclear reactors is making it possible to slow the hydrogen reaction so that power derived from the explosion of a hydrogen bomb can be utilized to benefit, rather than destroy, humanity. This is a research effort which has been going on for many years. I have stood in the well of this House on this occasion for the past many years and, I hope, made it very well known that progress on this effort is much too slow.

Again, I emphasize that the Atomic Energy Commission is making a substantial effort and expending a significant amount of money in this effort. But I cannot believe that there is as much emphasis directed toward the solution of this particular problem in the atomic energy program as there should be.

Bear in mind that if this phenomenon can be harnessed—and to harness it is no small feat because it generates heat in excess of that generated on the sun—then we will have electricity which produced from the process itself. We will have heat which can be controlled.

The end product of this means of power production is helium, an inert gas, which we know cannot be burned and is not an atmospheric pollutant. It would not be necessary to take out cores of fissionable material and try to dump them somewhere in a salt cave or the bottom of an ocean and then hope they do not get loose and cause anyone problems.

One would not have that type of residue, from this process, so that it would solve one of the really great problems we have in the use of nuclear reactors today.

But in the next breath I must admit that although we have tried we have not been able to spend over \$29 million this year in the research for the controlled thermonuclear reactor. Unfortunately, there has not been the type of scientific breakthrough which is necessary before we can profitably spend more money.

There has been some development. The Russians have been able, by the use of a rather weird object called a Tokamak, to bend magnetic fields roughly into the shape of a bottle which can contain the high temperature and great power released by the thermonuclear reaction when it forms itself into a very hot plasma.

So we are making some progress. We in the United States have also been able to contain the plasma formed by the reaction for longer periods of time than had been possible previously. We used to measure containment in terms of a millionth of a second, but we are now able to contain plasma for two-fifths of a second. This certainly is some sort of a breakthrough. However, we have not been able to contain reactions which have the temperature required for a sustained reaction for any prolonged period of time. So we have a long way to go.

Insofar as the fission process is concerned—the main process of obtaining nuclear energy—the light metal breeder reactor approach is considered the most promising process on the horizon. The breeder reactor is rather strange, in that it produces, in the process of forming power, more fissionable material than it uses up. In other words, it produces plutonium, which in itself is a fissionable material. However, there is some problem with regard to the technology of the light metal breeder reactor, so that we are also financing an alternative method known as the gas cooled reactor.

In this area we are also in the process of experimentation, but much more additional research is needed than we have seen to date in the controlled thermonuclear device.

To return to the environment, I have already mentioned that some damage to the environment will result from any way we develop electric power at the present time. I merely ask that my colleagues in the House and my fellow citizens in the country realize that we are on the horns of a dilemma. I do not believe there is any doubt but that the people of this country, concerned as they are about the environment, would much prefer to develop electric power without any damage to the environment.

That is the goal toward which we are all working. But the fact is that we have not arrived at that goal, and if we now moved to curtail the production of electric power in this country we would see the results that occur whenever there is a shortage of power. We would face brownouts, and we would see industry fail to expand because it does not have any power with which to expand. We

would see the loss of jobs, and we would experience results in our economy which no one wants to see. So we find it necessary to continue to produce electric power in ever-increasing quantities because without it we would be faced with serious economic dislocation—dislocation in the lives of our people which they do not want, and which we must not have.

So there is this interplay or dilemma between the speed with which we protect the environment from some pollution and the speed at which it is necessary to produce more electric power for jobs for people.

It is a well known fact that if we are not able to do something to increase power production within this year there may be brownouts in certain locations in the eastern part of the United States.

In my part of the United States, in the West, we will undoubtedly have brownouts by 1975 unless we are able to produce much more electric power than we have even projected at the present time.

It is also necessary for us to complete the work of intertying the power facilities of the Northwest and the Southwest because of the disparity of their power requirements. This is a very feasible thing to do. At the present time, when there is a surplus of power in the Southwest, there is a shortage in the Northwest and vice versa.

Rather than produce or build new sources of energy, it is possible to use surplus energy in any area to handle the shortage which occurs in other parts of the country.

I say to you that the time is coming when the fact of the existence of the disparity of energy requirements must be taken into consideration in other parts of the country.

For instance, the New England area, which is short of power, will be shorter as time goes by, and will eventually find itself without adequate power unless something is done to bring in surplus power from the TVA area or from other parts of the country where surplus power exists.

I think it is worthy to note that in our hearings on the TVA, we discovered there were some power facilities surplus to the needs of the TVA. We asked them why they did not use those surplus facilities to supply power to some of the areas on the eastern seaboard where power is needed, and were told they could not do so because they could not get enough coal to fire those surplus facilities.

The bottleneck is not in the mining industry, but apparently in the ability of the railroads to deliver enough coal to meet this need. The required coal cars are not available—they are tied up in ports, still loaded with coal, because of unrealistic demurrage charges.

In fact, we were told that in the TVA system there is only about a 19-day supply of coal on hand at any given time. It certainly is not safe to limit the TVA or any other power producing facility to a mere 19-day fuel supply. After all, we have had strikes and work stoppages and other matters which have interfered with the delivery of coal and

other fuels in the past. We cannot, of course, be sure that such work stoppages might not occur in the future.

The pipeline for Corps of Engineers projects is down by \$626 million—or will be—by the end of fiscal year 1971.

This pipeline has been reduced regularly every year for the last several years. This means, of course, that the Nation, irrespective of what it may prefer, is seeing its priorities altered to the extent that there is less of the national budget being spent today on such things as flood control, navigation and water development than we spent in previous years.

The pipeline of the Bureau of Reclamation is up somewhat because of the start of some new projects. However, it is still far below the amount of money which has been expended by the Bureau of Reclamation in years past and far below the requirement of the reclamation States for water development and other activities in these States for which the Bureau of Reclamation is responsible.

I think it is also useful to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that amounts provided for operation and maintenance for the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and other entities treated in this bill are up. This is true for two reasons—first, because we have completed more projects in the past several years than we have started, and also that these projects for which the construction phase is completed require operation and maintenance. Consequently, there are more projects to operate and maintain than there used to be.

However, the cost of operation and maintenance has also increased because of the astronomical inflation of the past few years.

So it has become necessary for us to recognize this and provide more funds for the operation and maintenance activities of all of the agencies that are funded in this bill.

I think in closing I should mention the recreational facilities that are provided and funded in this bill. I think that nobody would disagree with this idea. Water recreation is certainly a part of the life of most Americans these days. They want it. They desire it, and this committee should do all it can to supply the necessary facilities.

I should say, however, it is our policy in figuring the benefit-to-cost ratio of these projects to make certain that the benefits are primarily justified by something other than recreation. In other words, if too large a part of the benefits in the benefit-to-cost ratio is provided only by recreation, we then consider the project with some reservation.

This bill also includes projects which have as a large part of their justification the production of water for municipal use. These municipal water costs are repaid to the Federal Government with interest, unless it is a reclamation project where irrigation is involved. In the latter case, the cost is repaid without interest.

In other words, much of the money

that we put into these programs actually comes back to the Federal Government, and some of it with interest. I am sure this is what my friend from Tennessee meant when he said that this is an all-American bill. It is an investment in the future of our country. It is not primarily a handout, although there are certain grant items in the bill. It is a recognition of the fact that there is a great Federal responsibility in passing the natural resources of this Nation on to the people who come after us in a better condition than we found them when we inherited the leadership of this Nation.

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

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

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona yielding to me.

I rise in support of the measure.

It is appreciated that the committee included the second year's portion of preconstruction planning funds for the Salem Church Reservoir in the amount of \$600,000, the full amount as recommended by the President. This reservoir, when completed, will span the Rappahannock River about 6 miles upstream from Fredericksburg, Va. The Rappahannock is a beautiful river and I was privileged to travel it recently with my son along the entire area of the river that will be affected by the dam and reservoir. While we enjoyed the day spent on the river, it is my hope that when construction is completed, many more will be able to use and enjoy the pleasures of water-oriented recreation on the spacious lake which will be created.

What may be much more important even than these recreational aspects is the water supply that will be made available by this dam. The project is within the urban corridor between Washington and Richmond, the most populous and fastest growing area of Virginia. The population within a radius of 50 miles was estimated to be approximately 2,500,000 people in 1960 but is expected to rise to 7,000,000 people within 50 years. Counties in northern Virginia with a projected shortage of water because of their rapid growth such as Prince William will be assured of an adequate supply many years into the future. In addition this multipurpose project will provide flood control as well as salinity control for those stretches of the river downstream from the dam. Certainly a well-regulated stream below the dam will tend to minimize the adverse effects of any waste material going into the stream and help to control pollution. It is a pleasure to support this bill and the worthwhile project for the Salem Church Reservoir.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may require to the distinguished and able gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) and the able gentleman from

Arizona (Mr. RHODES) have explained, with their constant competence, the bill that the committee is now considering.

I want, also, Mr. Chairman, to commend the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) for the tremendous amount of work, and time, he spent on this bill. Because of the bind in which the several subcommittees on appropriations found themselves in, this year, and the reporting time, and deadline against which the Appropriations Committee was working, it was left to Mr. WHITTEN, to carry the burden of the majority, in chairing the public works subcommittee on appropriations. All through the hundreds of pages of hearings, is reflected the uncanny ability, perceptiveness and thoroughness of the manner in which Mr. WHITTEN handled his task.

He was ably assisted by the minority members—Mr. RHODES of Arizona, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, Mr. ROBISON of New York, and by our colleagues Mr. EVINS of Tennessee and Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama.

I cite, too, the staff of this committee, the brilliant work of Gene Wilhelm, assisted by George Urian.

Mr. Chairman, this is the last time that this bill will bear the name of the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN of Ohio. Because of a continuing and debilitating illness, Mr. KIRWAN announced, many months ago, his retirement from the Congress.

MIKE KIRWAN has been a member of the Appropriations Committee for 27 years and has served as the chairman of this subcommittee since 1965. As a member of the full committee, and member of and chairman of the Interior Subcommittee from 1949 to 1965, and present chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee, his spirit, his dedication, and his diamond-rough and unique personality have left their marks, into perpetuity, on the face of our Nation.

Flood control, recreation, navigation, power supply, water resources, conservation, forest lands, national parks—all of these and more, have been the beneficiaries of his strength of purpose and his dedication.

I repeat what I said last year when this bill was on the floor. When he leaves this Congress, he will carry with him the gratitude of Members, past and present, who understood what his service has meant to this country.

I can only add, that we are not likely to see his kind again.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill with one exception. I regret that the full committee deleted funds for the Dickey-Lincoln School Reservoirs in Maine. The subcommittee approved the budget request of \$807,000 to continue planning for this project for fiscal year 1971. The full committee did not approve this recommendation.

When the bill is read for amendment, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY) will seek to restore the budgeted amount of \$807,000. I intend to support Mr. HATHAWAY's amendment.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to recognize and express my personal thanks to all members of the committee and their very excellent and capable staff that serves the cause of water resource development throughout the Nation.

In particular, I believe special recognition must go to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) who has become a true champion of water conservation, pollution abatement, and water quality control as well as other water-related programs and projects. The gentleman has devoted hundreds of man-hours listening to testimony, to researching this complex subject, and, in the process, has become one of the best informed and most articulate spokesman in the country in this field.

With all of the gentleman's extra duties and responsibilities, it is difficult to comprehend how one man can accomplish so much. Mr. RHODES, however, has always been extremely fair to all of our requests and recommendations and this bill is no exception. Serving, as I do, on the authorizing Flood Control Subcommittee, I am somewhat familiar with the role he has played and I believe I speak for many when I say that we all owe him a deep debt of gratitude.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to make a brief comment, to concur in what the gentleman from Massachusetts has said with regard to the excellent manner in which the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations has worked to bring out what I think is a fine and excellent bill.

The words of praise the gentleman from Massachusetts has bestowed upon our friend, the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN, I also concur in. He will always be recognized as a great builder of projects which have been certainly worthwhile.

Again, let me emphasize that, in my judgment, this is a very responsible and responsive appropriations bill. It is, indeed, gratifying to see how the allocation of funds, in this instance, has been distributed fairly and, yet, the total allocation has been kept below the total amount originally budgeted. This, certainly, is legislative responsibility at its very best.

I strongly urge favorable consideration and passage of this bill.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from California (Mr. CLAUSEN). He knows that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KIRWAN) was one who was completely familiar with the resources and needs of the State of California and the Public Works projects in the Department of Interior and Corps of Engineers. Mr. KIRWAN was a consistent friend of the State of California and recognized what these projects have done and can do for that great State.

I know Mr. KIRWAN will appreciate the words of the gentleman from California.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleague, the gentleman from California, DON H. CLAUSEN, in stating my approval of the fine work the full committee has done in bringing this bill to the House.

I, too, was in the hospital and saw the very able chairman, the gentleman from Ohio. I know how sick he was.

I want to say to all the people of this House that certainly California has benefited greatly from the consideration given by the chairman, MIKE KIRWAN, in recent years. Much of the wealth of the economy in the northern part of our State is a great tribute to what MIKE KIRWAN has done for California. The Governor of our State and the people dealing with water resources development have all been in to testify before his committee. They have received the gentleman from Ohio in Sacramento, the State capital. They join me, I know, in wishing the gentleman well in his confinement in the hospital, as do all Californians. We are very sad he is not here on the floor. He has always given us a very fine bill on public works.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON).

I may say that the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON), as well as the other members of the California delegation have all recognized what the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KIRWAN) did for the State of California.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who just spoke represents, I think the largest geographical congressional area in California. There are a large number of reservoirs, including the Buchanan, and Hidden which he has sponsored, and they are provided for in this bill.

Members who served with the late Congressman and Senator Clair Engle know that he was a giant in his service to and appreciation for the need for water resources in California. Certainly the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON) is a worthy successor to our former beloved and late lamented colleague, Clair Engle.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pay my respects to the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN. In my judgment he is one of the most able men who ever served in this body. America is the lesser because this man is not here today to help us out.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman speaks from experience. I think she is one of the few ladies of the Congress and one of the few ladies who has ever gone to the gentleman's district and spoken for MIKE KIRWAN in the teeming area of Youngstown. I know over the years she has been a friend of our very distinguished colleague. I know he will appreciate her remarks.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. It always gives me great pleasure to speak well of MIKE KIRWAN.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the committee for bringing forth this report on the various projects which exist throughout the United States and their attempt to fund those projects with adequate money in most places.

I also would like to pay special tribute to the chairman, MIKE KIRWAN, because he has contributed much to my own State of Colorado, in trying to see that we obtain needed water so that it may be used in the future.

MIKE KIRWAN has always been a man one can go to, one who understood the problem, who was sympathetic with the problem, who knew we had to continue to preserve the natural resources of this country.

As the gentleman has ably pointed out, we will not see another who will be able to recognize these problems as well as MIKE KIRWAN has.

Mr. BOLAND. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

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

Mr. BEALL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join in urging the passage of this legislation appropriating funds for public works in the areas of water, pollution control, and power development for fiscal year 1971.

While the public works appropriation has always been legislation of major significance, it perhaps is of even more importance this year as we enter a period of changing national priorities. High on the list of these national priorities is the improvement of environmental quality. Because of the amounts of money made available through this legislation major steps are about to be taken in meeting our new national goals.

As one whose district borders the Potomac River, I, of course, am particularly concerned with projects that will lead to the improvement of water quality and to the augmentation of water supply for the many thousands of people who border on this body of water. Included in the bill before us today is the first construction appropriation for the Bloomington Dam and Reservoir in Maryland and West Virginia on the north branch of the Potomac River. This project was one of the series recommended by the Corps of Engineers a number of years ago and its construction has been long awaited by people in the Metropolitan Washington area as well as those bordering other parts of the Potomac.

This dam will be of great benefit to thousands of people living along the river because of its recreational, economic, and environmental consequences. In addition, it will provide almost certain elimination of the threat of flood. There have been six floods since 1924 and a recurrence of the flood of record at the present time would cause estimated damage in excess of \$8,200,000.

The low flow augmentation features of this project will increase the dependable flow of water along the river. The

Bloomington project will meet the presently projected needs of the north branch through 1990. In addition, the supplemental flow will partially meet the existing requirements for water, quality control, and the future requirements for water supply in the Washington Metropolitan area.

Important also in the consideration of this particular project is the fact that local governments along the river have cooperated to the fullest extent with Federal authorities in apportioning costs and commitments have been made to repay the Federal share of the cost attributable to water supply. In this particular project there has been an unusual amount of participation by the various levels of government in discussions leading up to drawing the necessary contractual obligations. As a result of this cooperative effort between various levels of government, the project is receiving acceptance in each area.

Construction of the Bloomington Dam and Reservoir is of great significance for the future development of the entire Potomac River and I congratulate the committee in agreeing to and recommending the requested appropriation of \$4.8 million. This is a major step to the improvement of the environmental quality in a principal area of the eastern part of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this bill.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to reaffirm my strong support of this bill and particularly the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway project.

The First District of Alabama, which I am privileged to represent, stands to gain much from construction of this waterway. Experts have predicted that shipping tonnage through the great Port of Mobile will at least double due to this vital waterway.

In addition, it will save both time and money in barging cargoes from inland States to Mobile. The 253-mile waterway will link the Tennessee River to the confluence of the Tombigbee and Warrior Rivers near Demopolis, Ala., shortening the distance from Tennessee River cities to the Gulf of Mexico by some 700 miles.

But the project is vital nationally also, not just in Mobile or Alabama. Economically, some 23 States stand to profit from construction of the waterway as vast new areas are opened for industrial development, new markets are established and new jobs are created.

A recent survey shows the significant effects a water route has on the economy of adjacent land areas. Of the Nation's 3,103 counties, 633 or a mere 20 percent are waterfront counties. Yet these counties are responsible for 58 percent of the Nation's productivity; 55 percent of the Nation's manufacturing jobs; and 57 percent of all new investments in manufacturing facilities.

Obviously, then, the land along the Nation's waterways is where the action is. It is up to us to extend this action and this prosperity to as many areas as possible.

The Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway will pass through some of the least developed sections of our country. These are areas that need and receive massive assistance from the Federal Government.

In the area where initial construction will begin, there are nine counties whose economic statistics are startling.

Eight of these counties are considered rural by Office of Economic Opportunity standards. Seven participate in the Department of Agriculture's food stamp program. All are well below the national average in health personnel and hospital beds per 100,000 population ratio.

With respect to income, all nine counties have more families with income below \$3,000, on the average, than the rest of the Nation. To cite some 1960 statistics:

In one county between 25 and 35 percent of the families earn less than \$3,000. Another has between 35 and 50 percent in this category. Five of the counties have 50 to 65 percent who earn less than \$3,000. And two counties have incomes of less than \$3,000 going to between 65 and 85 percent of the families.

In terms of buying power per capita the figures are even more demoralizing. The range lies between \$883 and \$1,636. You cannot buy too many welfare Cadillacs for that price.

This Congress and President Nixon have been talking a good deal about welfare reform and the need to eliminate poverty. What better assistance could we offer than a new way of life through better jobs and income? People do not want handouts.

The waterway brings with it jobs, both on a short-term and long-term basis. Immediately, it offers jobs on construction crews and the use of local resources. In the future, it offers new industry creating new jobs.

President Nixon knows this. The great Committee on Appropriations knows this. And in keeping with his efforts to provide jobs for every American, whether he is living in the cities or in the rural areas of the country, the President has requested funds to begin construction on the waterway during the next fiscal year. The Committee on Appropriations very wisely included in the bill the full amount budgeted, \$1 million.

I have worked long and hard with my fellow Representatives and Senators in behalf of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. Seeing the possibility of an actual construction start within our grasp is indeed gratifying.

Over the years, I have made numerous contacts with the President in behalf of the waterway. During this past year, I have acted as Washington coordinator of the effort to get construction funds included in the Presidential budget for fiscal 1971.

Through meetings with the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, and

the Presidential staff, the road has been long and arduous. But, if approved by Congress, this appropriation will start construction of a truly monumental waterway.

From 1967 to date, Congress has appropriated some \$1,485,000 for advanced engineering and preconstruction planning on the Tenn-Tom. The planning is done. The project is feasible. It is time to move ahead.

The total effect of Tennessee-Tombigbee cannot be forecast. The potential is limitless. But the effects will be there—effects on agriculture, commerce, industry, space, defense, recreation, economy, even water pollution. To the people of this area, the waterway means new hope and a new way of life. For many, it represents their only hope for the future.

The people of Alabama join me in urging your approval of the full amount budgeted for the Tennessee-Tombigbee during fiscal year 1971 by the President. An allocation of \$1 million would mean the first step toward making the dream of these people a reality.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to MIKE KIRWAN, a great American, whose contributions to our Nation would fill many books.

I wish to thank my colleagues on this subcommittee—JOE EVINS, of Tennessee, EDDIE BOLAND, of Massachusetts, GEORGE ANDREWS, of Alabama, JOHN RHODES, of Arizona, GLENN DAVIS, of Wisconsin, and HOWARD ROBISON, of New York—there are none better—for the gracious way in which they have worked with me on the subcommittee and the way they have treated me on the floor. While I rank third on the subcommittee, due to the fact that my major assignment has been in the afternoon I was able to carry much of the time-consuming hearings with the cooperation of my colleagues, and of course they handled many of the subjects.

I also want to thank the other Members of the Congress. We sometimes lose track of how valuable the Members of the House of Representatives and the Members of the other body are to their constituents and thereby to the Nation. As one sits there and holds hearings, and sees his colleagues come before the subcommittee, with their constituents, he is impressed with their ability and their devotion to the areas they represent.

I am sure that this subcommittee this year had something in excess of 1,000 witnesses before it. Observing constituents from every nook and corner of the United States come before the subcommittee, represented by their Member of Congress, one realizes that this is a great Nation we have, and it will remain so as long as we have that backbone and that background on which to draw to meet the many problems we do face today.

It makes one realize that while today many people have become urbanized and have gotten away from basic things in

life, to the point that we no longer fully appreciate where life and wealth come from, there remain millions of people who do know that real wealth comes from the land.

As I hear people say what they have done to look after the rural people or what they have done to look after the farmers, it kind of strikes me as being odd to hear a fellow who eats and wears and sleeps in that which is provided by these relatively few people, talking about what he is doing for them, when it is they who are doing for him.

Now we come to the point I make here. In this field of protecting and developing our resources, we are dealing with a statue to MIKE KIRWAN, a statue which will exist as long as there is a United States of America. As I said on this floor and as MIKE could point out in better words, because he can get to the point a little bit quicker, it does not make any difference how much money you may leave to your children and your children's children. You can leave a balanced budget and you can leave everything under the sun—but if you leave a worn-out country your descendants will still have nothing on which to build.

As I realize, and as this committee and this subcommittee had to realize, there is a limit to what you can do in taking care of your own country. This is because people have different interests and different viewpoints, and you have to get the bill through the House, through the Senate, and the Congress.

Yet within those limits we must try to allocate within and between regions and districts and try to be fair to each section.

I have been told that an average of 40 acres of topsoil flows down the Mississippi River past Memphis, Tenn., each day in the year. This is despite the fact that we have built over 2 million small dams, in addition to our large dams and other programs.

As we think of that, and this is the way MIKE used to say it—listen to me, because I want you to hear this—if you have a leak in your roof, you know it has to be fixed, because if you do not fix it, it will come through the ceiling rotting the wood. If you do not fix the ceiling, it will get down on the floor and go through the floor. If you let it keep on going, what was first a leaking roof will eventually destroy the very foundation of the house.

So, despite the fact that we have inflation, we have the one thing here that you cannot delay; namely, taking care of your own country, because conditions get worse each and every month and each and every year that we delay necessary works; and also it gets more expensive to handle if we can handle the problem at all.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to pay tribute not only to the members of the subcommittee but to the staff of the committee, which is most able, headed by our good friend Gene Wilhelm.

Mr. Chairman, the compelling need for expansion of the water resources program in the immediate future is evident

from the forecast of water requirements made in the first assessment of the Nation's water resources completed in 1968 by the Water Resources Council. These findings, based on a projected population of about 468 million in the United States by 2020, included the following:

First. Water quality, pollution control: Projected capital outlays required for waste treatment, sanitary sewers, and water cooling requirements are estimated at \$20 billion for the 5-year period 1969-73.

Second. Water Supply: Requirements for municipal water systems are expected to triple—from 24 billion to 74 billion gallons a day—by 2020.

Industrial water use will increase over 300 percent—from 46 billion to 211 billion gallons a day—by 2020.

Steam-electric power is projected to increase its fresh water withdrawals from 63 billion to 411 billion gallons a day by 2020.

Third. Flood control: Based on the current status of flood control works and projected conditions of flood-plain use and development:

The total annual flood damage potential for the Nation is anticipated to increase from \$1.7 billion in 1966 to \$5 billion in 2020. \* \* \* Construction programs for flood damage abatement, if continued at rates consistent with past trends, at best would only stem this upward trend in flood losses, and hold the residual losses by 2020 to \$2 billion annually.

Fourth. Waterways: Waterborne tonnage on the inland waterways, which now constitutes 15 percent of the intercity commerce, is projected to increase six times in the next 50 years requiring substantial waterway improvements, including locks, navigation aids, and recreation facilities. Pleasure craft are estimated to increase from about 8 million to 30 million by 2020.

Fifth. Recreation: About one-fourth of all outdoor recreation is and will continue to be dependent on water; participation in water-oriented sports is projected to increase from 2.8 billion activity days to 7.7 billion by 2000.

With these facts before us, there is not a State nor a district that does not have needs and, as our report shows, we have tried to meet those needs. Since those who preceded me have covered the national aspects, I place in the RECORD what our subcommittee has included in this bill of special significance to my own section, some small, some large but all important to the protection and development of the area.

Upper Auxiliary Channel, Ascalmore-Tippo, and Opossum Bayous—\$260,000, the corps capability together with funds to complete the bridges at Paducah Wells and Crowder, a boat ramp at Enid Reservoir.

And in the bill:

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

For expenses necessary for prosecuting work of flood control, and rescue work, repair, restoration, or maintenance of flood control projects threatened or destroyed by flood, as authorized by law (33 U.S.C. 702a, 702g-1), \$79,578,000, to remain available

until expended, including funds for completion of the construction of road crossings of the Panola-Quitman Floodway at Crowder and Paducah Wells, Mississippi: *Provided*, That not less than \$250,000 shall be available for bank stabilization measures as determined by the Chief of Engineers to be advisable for the control of bank erosion of streams in the Yazoo Basin, including the foothill area, and where necessary such measures shall complement similar works planned and constructed by the Soil Conservation Service and be limited to the areas of responsibility mutually agreeable to the District Engineer and the State Conservationist.

Included, too, are funds for continuing the study on Hatchie River, flood control on the Tombigbee and tributaries, and two major starts so vital to the people of seven States. I am particularly gratified that the committee provided \$1,250,000 for the Yellow Creek project which will begin development of the first port on the Mississippi side of the Tennessee River.

We had to revive this project, which now has a cost-benefit ratio of 6 to 1.

This project will open up the whole area of north Mississippi to heavy industry in the high wage bracket, which should boost average wage earnings.

The project would entail construction of first, river terminal on Yellow Creek for handling freight and transferring it between barges and railcars or trucks; second, a rail spur to the railway; and third, a highway connection between State Route 25 and the river terminal.

The TVA estimates the port area would attract 15 industrial firms in 25 years, provide some 2,820 jobs, an annual payroll in excess of \$2,000,000, and add an additional income for the area of \$13,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, MIKE KIRWAN would love to be here where today we provide \$1,000,000 for the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, a longtime dream for the people of seven States and of many of my predecessors, all of whom contributed so much to bringing this day about. In his absence because of illness, I am proud to preside over the Committee here today as we get construction of this tremendous Tennessee-Tombigbee navigation project started.

This navigation project will leave the Tennessee River near the common boundary of Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee, proceed south on Yellow Creek, crossing the divide in a deep cut to Mackey's Creek follow the east fork of the Tombigbee River into the main stream of the Tombigbee which flows to Demopolis, where it joins the canalized Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway.

The project will provide a 9-foot, slack water navigation channel with bottom widths of 280 feet in the divide cut and 300 feet on the remainder of the route.

Two years ago I got a half million dollars provided in advance on condition that a favorable report was made, thereby helping to get such a favorable report. This was followed by 2 years of preliminary planning and engineering, which makes construction now in order.

Mr. Chairman, I could go into detail on projects all over the country, a list of which appears in our report, for I developed in the record, facts to support similar projects everywhere—with 483,000,000 people as against our present 215,000,000, expected within 50 years, what we do here is a must.

We bring before you today a bill that is nominal insofar as compared to the space program, and it is peanuts as compared to Defense expenditures. I am not condemning any of these other programs that the Government has, but can you imagine a lesser percentage of the national income going to preserve the very basis of all of it? About \$2.5 billion or \$5.5 billion if you include the Atomic Energy Commission.

In a nutshell, Mr. Chairman, we have tried to provide this year enough money so that when added to that which was held up last year and not expended, would put us back in the position where we can catch up with work on these projects in a reasonable manner.

Mr. Chairman, we have brought you a good bill. I believe we deserve your support.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to pay tribute to this very hard-working subcommittee. I had the honor of serving for a short time on the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee, and I am somewhat familiar with what you have to go through because the needs are so great and so much needs to be done. Yet you have the constraints—the budget constraints. I want to join with the gentleman in the well and our other colleagues in paying tribute to that great man, MICHAEL KIRWAN, of Ohio, because he is one of the most able advocates of the people in looking after and preserving this country. I know that Chairman KIRWAN used to get so frustrated and irritated at the label of "pork barrel" which was placed on this bill when people from all over the Nation came before the subcommittee to testify as to their needs.

Mr. Chairman, this bill represents an investment in America. It represents the preservation of our country for our children to come.

Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished gentleman in the well has stated, MICHAEL KIRWAN has really done more than his part in preserving this great land of ours. This subcommittee and the distinguished members of the subcommittee have indeed carried forward in this respect.

Now, one thing I would like to ask the gentleman, since I have been reading some of the hearings—and I think the gentleman was presiding at the time—has to do with the funds contained in the bill for the Federal Water Quality Administration. I would hope that the administration is as eager as your committee and we, the Members of the Congress, are to get "with it," so to speak, and help clear up our problem of pollution.

My home city had the misfortune of being highlighted on a television show as having the filthiest channel, the Houston ship channel, in the country. Of course, it is very little affected by the tide and has no current. It is just sitting there, just lying there motionless.

Now, Texas is not just sitting on its haunches waiting and doing nothing. They created a gulf to Houston Waste Disposal Authority; that is, the State legislature did, which takes in three counties, Chambers County, Harris County, and Galveston County. Harris County is where Houston is, which is my district; and the other two counties are in the district represented by my distinguished colleague (Mr. Brooks).

The problem is that you cannot possibly pick out one little segment, you have to tackle such a thing on an area basis. Well, they are ready to go to work. However, they have been having some preliminary discussions with the Federal Water Quality Administration, and they are not getting too much encouragement. They are not asking for anything except a little money to get the thing started, because the way the law is written they have to have endorsements from other cities, localities, and so forth, that they will come up and pass revenue bonds that will pay the projects off. They need just a small amount of money to get started, and I would think that this would come under this administration.

Mr. WHITTEN. It is my opinion that we may be able to meet that. As the gentleman knows, in this matter of environment and protecting the environment, and this antipollution program, the wave of public concern concerning this has rolled over the United States, but it is still comparatively recent—I do not mean that the need has not existed, but that the public awareness, as always occurs when you get into something that big, is beginning to become aroused. I think everybody recognizes the need to get it organized, and get it going, and I do think that we will be able to meet this type of problem as well as others as this program does develop and unfold. But I think we can get further if we take it slowly and proceed with some of the primary proposals as against just picking too many different proposals.

Mr. CASEY. I am not critical of the committee, nor critical of the amount of money put in here; the only thing is that they have been somewhat discouraging as to whether they had the authority to give them any assistance.

Mr. WHITTEN. Of course, as to the authority, I will be glad to talk with the people, and I will be glad to discuss all of this with my distinguished colleague who is such a valuable member of the Committee on Appropriations, as to what we might be able to do. I think there are plenty of authorities now and money now to meet that type of problem; if not, it will require legislation which we will take up later. But it is my own opinion that the present legislation is broad enough to approach it.

Mr. CASEY. I would think so from the reading of the testimony, from the testimony in the hearings. However, I think

that somebody down there ought to re-read their authority and their ability to assist.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not mean to say this about anybody, but sometimes the people have reasons and they do not always set forth what the reasons might be. But we are moving slowly, and we have new people coming in, and it has not been easy to get experts in this comparatively new field.

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of pleasure and satisfaction to the words which have been said concerning our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KIRWAN), on this occasion of the presentation of his last bill before the Congress. My association with the gentleman and this subcommittee dates back to 1955 when, if my memory serves me correctly, a realignment of the Appropriations Subcommittee took place, and he structured this Public Works Appropriation Subcommittee in substantially the same form that it exists today. I think that it is a credit to the members and staff of our subcommittee that, in spite of his necessary absence during the hearings this year, the committee report and bill demonstrate that neither the quality of the work nor the quality of the product materially suffered.

The subcommittee is made up of men of experience, maturity, and judgment and this has made it possible for us to continue its work in an effective manner in the absence of our chairman.

Because this bill is the result of that quality of experience and judgment, it is a bill which I support and a bill which I shall support without amendments as it is considered on the floor of the House today.

It is not a bill that reflects complete agreement on each item on the part of each member of the subcommittee. But I do not know any bill of this proportion which affects practically every congressional district in this country, that could represent absolute unanimity of philosophy on every item included.

However, the chairman and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES), have mentioned something that I believe we are going to have to watch in the future.

This has been the trend in recent years to attach benefits to the various projects that extend much beyond the traditional economic justification that we considered in connection with these projects in the past. Major benefits relating to recreation, fish and wildlife, and economic development are put on a dollar-and-cents basis in the justification provided us for these projects.

I believe that in the future we will have to examine them to see whether they justify themselves on the basis of traditional economic benefits. Then, if that is the case, we can proceed to provide for these additional benefits such as recreation, fish and wildlife, and economic development.

But these fringe benefits should not be used, at least in my opinion, as the primary economic justification. In many cases, these kinds of benefits are conjectural and represent arbitrary assessments of dollar value based on assumptions that are very difficult to price in that manner.

Each year we have people who criticize the hydroelectric projects that are included in this bill. This is done on the basis that we are behind the times—that we are moving more deeply into the age of atomic power—and that we ought to, if farsighted, substitute the potential of atomic power for traditional hydroelectric projects. I have yet to see—and I think we have discussed this every year—a responsible spokesman who has given us any basis to believe that within our foreseeable time atomic power development can substitute for the hydroelectric power development, which constitutes a major portion of this bill.

The budget, as it came to us, did not include any direct appropriation for construction grants for waste treatment works.

The bill we have before us does include that kind of direct appropriation in precisely the same amount that had been contemplated in the budget.

The basis for not including direct appropriations for this purpose in the budget was the anticipation of new legislation, a contract-authority approach instead of direct appropriations. The anticipated legislation did not materialize, and so we have done the practical thing by providing necessary direct appropriations within the authorization of existing law. Every one of us on the subcommittee, while not specifically agreeing with the approach of the proposed new legislation, does recognize the need for new legislation in this area in order to permit the effective and efficient use of available funds.

I think it is a credit to our committee staff that the solution provided in this bill and explained in the report was worked out. It is an admirable solution and one that, in my opinion, should not be altered. I believe it would be a serious mistake to falsely raise the hopes of people who are greatly concerned in this area by providing funds that cannot be effectively and efficiently spent. This would mislead people into believing that money alone will provide the solution to this problem—a problem that touches every community in this Nation.

I believe the bill, as written, does all that can be done through dollars.

I expect that before this day is over everyone here will be tired of hearing the words Dickey-Lincoln. I think that you should all take much of the debate you will hear on this controversial project with a number of grains of salt. In my opinion the arguments, as I have seen them telescoped, will be considerably overdrawn on both sides of this highly controversial matter. We did have an objective staff study of this project last year, and from it I came to the conclusion that this project is at least as well justified, overall, as many of the projects which are funded in this bill.

For example, I do not believe that this

project is going to solve the alleged current shortages of electric power in the New England area. It is a huge project, and it will probably be 9 or 10 years before the power would come onto the line. There has been aggressive private development of power, so that reserves in this part of the country are considerably better, as a matter of fact, than they are in some of the other areas of the Nation.

In this bill, in connection with other projects, we have attempted to avoid committing ourselves to major new projects in the near future. This is not only common sense, it is vital in this period of critical fiscal problems. Under different economic conditions, however, I suggest that this project is justified, and at least equally as well as several that are funded in the bill.

So in order to make my position completely clear, and without entering into a discussion that you will become tired of before this day is over, my attitude closely parallels that of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND). We differ here today primarily as to the element of time. I believe this is an inappropriate time to proceed with so large a commitment in the years that lie immediately ahead. Consequently, I shall support this bill in this respect, as in all other respects, without amendments.

The budgeted items are realistically funded, and the bill does provide for a reasonable number of critically needed and comparatively modest projects which have been brought to the attention of our committee by our colleagues. I believe we did the right thing in dealing with some of these problems that the Bureau of the Budget did not appropriately consider, but I also believe we took the appropriate course of action in not expanding our commitments beyond those which are already in the bill. I repeat that I intend to support this bill without any amendments.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, these remarks will be inserted in the Record at the request of one of my colleagues on this subcommittee since, on the day the 1971 public works appropriation bill is scheduled to be considered by the House, I shall be halfway around the world, serving as a member of the special committee recently set up by the House to investigate all aspects of our military involvement in the war in Indochina.

I sincerely regret not being able to be present during consideration of this, the sixth such appropriation bill I have been privileged to work on since becoming a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

I regret it since this day—the day we finally bring our annual bill before our colleagues—represents the culmination of a good many weeks of effort and thought on the part of each member of our subcommittee, and being absent on that day is something like being away from your wife's side when one of your children is born.

However, I am bold enough to wish to believe that there is some connection between the reasons for my absence on this day and the kind of public works bill our subcommittee may be able to

bring you in the future. For I think it must be obvious to all of us that the cost of the ongoing war in Southeast Asia—which has now become our Nation's longest war—has had a negative impact upon our ability to do the kind of things we need to do, and ought to be doing, with respect to our own manifest and manifold domestic problems, some of which are touched upon in the measure now before this body. Those problems—or those domestic needs—can well be summed up in Daniel Webster's admonition to his countrymen in words that appear over the Speaker's chair in this very Chamber and that are a constant reminder to us, his latter-day countrymen:

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

In saying this, Mr. Chairman, I am far from being so bold as to also suggest that I think my presence on the special Vietnam committee of inquiry will, in any way, resolve immediately our problems over there, thus freeing up for our own urgent purposes some of the tremendous investment we are making in the future of that faraway land; instead—as these words are written prior to my departure on that mission—it is my earnest and more modest prayer and hope that our special committee may be enabled, by virtue of our endeavors, to help clarify first for the House and, then, through it, for the American people, the nature of our continuing problems and responsibilities in Indochina, and possibly to in some way help this Congress, that I still believe is the greatest legislative body in the world, to find its way through to assisting our President in finding the best, the most honorable and expeditious, policy to follow to extricate ourselves from this war, and get on with our own, most urgent business here at home.

The outcome of that possible event, Mr. Chairman, is not now predictable, so let me deal, instead, with the more solid substance of the bill before us.

Let me say, at the outset, that I think it is a very good bill—as I hope our colleagues will agree. Given our present fiscal situation, I also think it is a most responsible bill but, yet, one under which considerable progress can and will be made toward meeting our higher priority needs insofar as the same fall within the jurisdiction of our subcommittee.

#### THE QUESTION OF COMPETING PRIORITIES

One cannot consider the water resource programs—and there are several such—funded through this vehicle without, especially in a time calling for fiscal restraint, emphasizing constantly the need for ever more careful consideration of priorities; priorities as between programs, and priorities as between projects.

I suppose it might be said by my colleagues on this subcommittee that I have been something of a "nut," during my 6 years of service on it, over this question of priorities. If so, I make no apologies

for it because I have seen it as absolutely essential for a subcommittee such as ours to have better information than we did when I was first assigned to it, if we were ever to be able to make sound value-judgments relative to budgetary allocations in the water resource field. I do not think we used to get that kind of information—as we listened in prior years to the various water resource agencies like the Bureau of Reclamation, or the Corps of Engineers, for instance, come before us to attempt to justify programs and projects that they, themselves, had developed and, if we funded them, would eventually carry out. It is still true that such agencies are both advocate and builder of the projects they have in mind—and there is still something bothersome to me in a system that enables the sponsor of such a project to also determine its feasibility, subject, of course, to our powers of oversight.

If that system had continued unchanged, this Nation could never have hoped to develop anything remotely resembling a national water policy—something so tremendously important in light of such projections as that, 10 years from now, our people will be needing about 50 percent more water than they now use.

It is still largely true that a water-resource project's sponsor determines that project's feasibility, though under somewhat better guidelines than we had a few years back, but the big difference now is the interposition in the planning process of the National Water Resources Council—a permanent, coordinating body created by Congress in 1965 and that is just now coming into its own—whose work is being supplemented, with regard to the development of broad policy questions, by the temporary National Water Commission, a planning group we established back in 1968 and whose members are supposed to make their report and recommendations to the President and the Congress in 1973.

Out of all this, I believe, will eventually come the first national water policy we have ever had worthy of the name; and we need just such a policy as soon as possible.

I have been pleased, Mr. Chairman, to lend my help in this direction—both as a member of this subcommittee, and as a voting Member of Congress; and some of the fruits of these efforts are already evident. For, with this increasing emphasis on planning to serve long-range purposes, the water resource agencies that appear before us are each now doing a better job than formerly in applying their own, rational, analytical techniques. The Corps of Engineers, for instance, is now following a 5-year capital-budgeting approach, up-dated annually, and aimed at providing a better basis for selecting new construction and planning starts, and for allocating the funds available for civil works on a better basis among its 19 major national regions. To supplement this system—which, as we were told, itself makes no decisions, but organizes the information necessary for rational decisions—the corps has also developed its own Institute for Water Resources, as is mentioned in our report,

to incorporate into its project-planning processes the questions of environmental values, water pollution, aesthetics and ecology and so on, all aimed at what the corps is calling a "total water management" technique.

I am very impressed, and pleased, with this kind of a development, and I would encourage those who have been particularly critical of the corps in recent years—and, as we know, it has some very vocal critics—to take a new look at the corps own new look.

For it is this sort of more enlightened approach to planning overall that will enable the corps not only to do a better job in the years ahead, but also to rid itself—and help this subcommittee rid itself—of whatever may remain of the "pork barrel" image this kind of bill used to carry.

Similarly, this kind of an approach will probably prevent, in the future, the kind of dilemma the subcommittee faced this year in connection with the cross-Florida barge canal project mentioned on page 58 of our report. I have always had some reservations about this project which was pretty far along in the planning stage well before I joined the subcommittee. But, more to the point, as many of you know the Secretary of the Interior has just recently asked the Secretary of the Army for a delay on further work under this project until its ecological effects can be restudied—and there are strong views both ways now in Florida as to this project's desirability, a situation that has left local people such as Florida's Governor Kirk badly in the "middle." Our subcommittee's problem, as is stated in the report, is that the project is close to being half done, with some \$52.7 million allocated toward it so far. So, what does one do now? Finding the proper answer is most difficult. I still hope something can be worked out between Interior and the corps so that whatever adverse effects the project may have on the environment can at least be minimized, and I am going along for the time being on the subcommittee's decision as stated in the report with that hope in mind, intending to do what I still can to further such a result.

But what we can do beyond this—and what I am sure the subcommittee intends to do from now on—is to make sure, as best we can, that no further major water projects go forward through our subcommittee without first being studied with sufficient care and precision to make certain they will not adversely affect the soil, water, plant, and human environment they may tend to alter.

#### WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

I would like to turn now, Mr. Chairman, to the water pollution control programs also funded through this bill.

As my colleagues have learned from studying our report, we have done about all we could see possible—through the appropriation process—to make the essential waste treatment grant program more effective, and toward meeting its actual fiscal needs.

I believe our decision to be a good one—fully defensible, even though I am sure

that, when our bill reaches the amendment stage, there will be an argument about the adequacy of our recommended level of funding, and probably a good many of my colleagues will support an amendment to increase that recommendation from the \$1 billion figure up to the remaining authorization of \$1.25 billion, all in pursuit of what will be called "full funding."

It will not be easy to vote against such an amendment, but about all those who will vote for it will be proving is that they are, somehow, "more against" water pollution than the next fellow. If any of my friends want to "spin their wheels" in that fashion, I do not say it is irresponsible—only that what they will be trying to do will be ineffective and that, if they truly wanted to help, they would besiege the legislative committee for action on the administration's proposal to make this a more effective program by changing the allocation formula along lines noted in our report, and to make other improvements in its workings. That is where the need for "action" is; and I strongly hope we will see such action on the administration's proposal to make this a more effective program by changing the allocation formula along lines noted in our report, and to make other improvements in its workings. That is where the need for "action" is; and I strongly hope we will see such action before this session ends.

Pending that, let me just say that I have worked toward and strongly support the funding approach we have here adopted—as a stop-gap measure; one under which, for the first time, we specifically allot money to that plaguing question of when and how to reimburse certain States, like New York, who have moved ahead with their own moneys in this field under the uncertain procedures set up for them by section 8(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. This is a most-necessary thing for us to do—and it is time we did it.

The results for a State like New York ought to be most salutary—for, out of the \$200 million we would set aside for reimbursement, New York would receive, based on figures available as of this past April 30, \$96,360,000. This would be in addition to its allocable share of the remaining \$800 million of the direct appropriation we suggest, which would amount to \$69,927,900—to which one has to add New York's share of the current year's \$800 million appropriation still unobligated, which figure, again as of April 30, was \$55,273,206, all of which would bring to New York for the purposes of the program a grand total of \$221,561,106 during the next 12 months or so, which is a far cry from the wholly inadequate amounts we were receiving under this program a year or so ago.

Is it still enough?

I think so, under all the circumstances, and based on all the evidence I can gather, both pro and con. We could use more, and will need more, to get the job fully done in the years immediately ahead; but, based on the condition of the market for local bonds, the capabilities of the engineering and construc-

tion industry, and the willingness and true intentions of the local municipal entities involved to go ahead now, I believe New York's combined share under our suggested formula will prove to be more than adequate for the time period involved.

One other thing, Mr. Chairman, in connection with all this: Most of us will recall last year's critical report by the General Accounting Office about the cost-effectiveness of this program, something the Department of Interior has been addressing itself to in subsequent months and, I think, in a proper fashion, as a reference to our hearings may help disclose. And I rather think that, out of this more or less forced re-evaluation of this program's workings will come some unexpected dividends—one of which might be the possibility of building such waste treatment plants on a regional basis.

As my colleagues on the subcommittee know, I have also been something of a "nut" on the idea of regional, or river basin, planning, and have been very pleased during my term on the subcommittee to see this approach also move forward. Let me give an example of what it might produce in this connection: You can find reference on page 170, of volume 1 of our hearings, to the now-completed Susquehanna River Basin re-study—of which project I was the original House sponsor some years ago—out of which, perhaps next month, will come a proposed "action plan" for our entire river basin for the people who live therein to study and consider, along with their local and State representatives in government, and with the coordinating assistance of the pending Susquehanna River Basin Compact Commission if we can get approval of that idea through this Congress, as I hope. I see this whole thing developing as a model, or pilot project, for other areas to follow, and leading toward planning, in the way we ought to be doing on a national level, for the "total management" of the water resources of the Susquehanna to the year 2000 and beyond.

This kind of an approach to the needs of the people of such a basin area is urgently needed, and I am proud to have played at least a small part in getting it adopted in the area in which I was born and raised, and which I am now privileged to, in part, represent in this body.

But, in any event, as I was told by the spokesman for the corps, which is managing this cooperative and fully coordinated re-study project, its work so far indicates the possibility of combining some 54 out of 90 communities along the Susquehanna needing waste treatment plants yet, into 12 regional treatment systems—with the resulting savings in capital investment, in operation costs, and in efficiency, that we have been missing by virtue of our present "first-come, first-served" approach which, as I have noted, the General Accounting Office has criticized, and properly so.

So, there is also that, Mr. Chairman, as further evidence of the fact that we are all learning, as we go along.

ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT—AND THE ROLE OF AEC

Mr. Chairman, the Atomic Energy Commission has for years enjoyed the enviable status of being favored with public confidence and congressional support. During those years, rapid and significant advances have been made in many areas related to the peaceful uses of atomic power, and the AEC has largely been able to avoid the stigma that the wartime use of the atomic bomb indelibly left in the memories of Americans. However, the awakening interest of the public in all types of environmental pollution has disturbed the quiet and has focused the attention of people more and more on the threat of nuclear power. It now seems, in retrospect, that the period of calm was due largely to a lack of public interest or awareness and not to the AEC's own public relations efforts, whatever they might have been.

Mr. Chairman, I point this out because, as a supporter of nuclear power, I see the danger inherent in our rejection of the peaceful uses of the atom. And, although I see the developing public furor as being somewhat misdirected and sometimes inaccurate, nevertheless, I believe that the blame for much of the current public concern must be laid at the door of the AEC. I would like, then, in this presentation to dwell generally on our needs for power, the position that nuclear power must play in meeting those needs and the means that can—and I believe must—be employed to make the uses of nuclear power compatible with both the need for that power and public acceptance of that source of power.

The need for energy is increasing at an astronomical rate. It is predicted that between now and the year 2000 we will use as much energy in the world as was used in the previous 2000 years.

The bulk of that energy in the United States is taking the form of electrical power. It is estimated that every 8 to 10 years our demand for electricity doubles, so that by the year 2000 we shall be using 8 times the amount of electricity that we currently consume. Some of this growth can be explained by the growth of our population, but a very significant portion is due to the increased per capita consumption. In 1950, we were consuming approximately 2,000 kilowatt-hours per person per year, and in 1969 this figure had jumped to 7,000 kilowatt-hours per person per year. Much of this increase in consumption came from new products which were introduced. For instance, the shift from a regular refrigerator to a frost-free refrigerator increases electricity consumption 30 percent and a shift from a black and white to a color television entails a 50-percent increase in electricity consumed. These factors lead us to the forecast that, while our current electrical generating capacity is 335 million kilowatts, 670 million kilowatts will be needed in 1980, and about 1,600 million kilowatts will be required by the year 2000.

Even today, our electrical generating capacity is inadequate. The power blackout which hit the Northeast in 1965 was

not a freak accident, but rather the harbinger of things to come in later years. The terms "blackout" and "brown-out" are new additions to our vocabularies and very real dangers to our society. This body has reacted to those dangers by installing equipment which will provide emergency power to run the elevators and operate the lights in Congress in case of just such a power failure. But, not many Americans are able to take such precautions. Experts in the area of electrical needs are hoping—nay, praying—for a cool summer because of the great likelihood of outages if the summer heat becomes too intense and the citizenry runs too many air conditioners and fans.

Perhaps, we could lessen this demand—and, therefore, lessen our generating capacity—by various means of limiting or apportioning consumption. One possibility would be to alter the industrial uses to nonpeak consumer hours. Another possibility would be to have a sufficient number of plants within a particular electric grid demand area, so that each power company would not feel compelled to build plants with built-in emergency reserve factors, relying instead on emergency assistance from other companies within their grids.

And yet, even after these adjustments were made, we would still be left with the need to vastly increase our electrical generating capability. In line with current technological knowledge, there are three potential sources for that electricity: Hydroelectric plants, fossil fuel plants and nuclear plants. As a practical matter, the first alternative is no alternative at all, since almost all of the suitable hydroelectric plant locations have already been used. Therefore, hydroelectric plants will remain supplemental and cannot absorb any significant portion of our increased demand for power.

Similarly, fossil fuels seem to be an unlikely source for three reasons. First, there are grave doubts as to the availability of enough fossil fuel reserves, particularly coal, to generate the amount of power that we will need by the year 2000.

Second, even were there enough fuel reserves, the task of transporting those fuels to the generating facilities would be virtually impossible. This problem was illustrated most graphically by Dr. Seaborg when, during our hearings, he hypothesized the situation of 1,500 fossil fuel generating plants each with a million kilowatt capacity operating at a three-fourths load capacity—roughly equal to our year 2000 needs—and burning daily 10 million tons of coal that would require the daily movement of 100,000 railway cars. Contrasted to those figures would be the same number of nuclear plants with the same capacities, but the nuclear plants would consume only 3 tons of fissionable materials daily. Third, even were we able to overcome the first two difficulties, the products of combustion which would be released into the atmosphere—heat, sulphur oxides, carbon monoxides and ash—would make our air virtually unbreathable.

As a practical matter, then, we are left with nuclear power as representing

our only realistic hope for a sufficient source of electricity without a host of other problems. Those factors which support our increasing reliance on nuclear power include the fact that there is plenty of uranium available for energy-producing purposes; it is relatively easy to move since it is not as bulky in its processed state as fossil fuels; there are no products of combustion since it does not burn and therefore no air is consumed, no carbon dioxide produced, and no other combustion byproducts; and nuclear power is competitive with electricity produced by fossil fuels both in terms of efficiency and cost.

But, nuclear power is not without its problems, and those problems are the prime source of the AEC's difficulties of today. It is not that these problems cannot be solved technologically, nor are they as serious as those which the burning of fossil fuels engender, but, rather, these problems have grown to their present proportions largely because of a seeming lack of responsiveness on the part of the AEC.

Before getting into the specific areas of concern, I would offer two general observations. First, that the safety record of the AEC is second to none. Over the years, the AEC has demonstrated that it is aware of and sensitive to the dangers of atomic power. This awareness is a reaction, in large part, to the fears of the public toward nuclear power that are the outgrowth of the atomic bombs of World War II and our current arsenal of nuclear weaponry. We all have difficulty in fully understanding how a force which holds such destructive capability as does nuclear energy can be safely used for peaceful and beneficial purposes. The AEC has been most careful to be certain that accidents cannot occur, for they recognize that their first accident might well be their last.

The second general observation that I would make is most unfortunate in light of that safety record. The AEC seems genuinely perplexed by the attacks of conservationists, scientists and the public. They point to their safety record with indignity, and they argue that, as scientists, they know more about the question of the safety of nuclear power than any private citizen. While I do not necessarily differ with their conclusions, I would note that their methodology leaves much to be desired. They have often chosen to stand and fight on the principle of an issue even though the merits were unimportant to them.

I point to these failings, Mr. Chairman, not to be critical of the men who work for the AEC, for I have nothing but respect both for their work and for them personally. But, I am concerned because we need nuclear power, and if that power is shrouded by public mistrust, our Nation will not be able to meet its power requirements in the future. I am concerned because I believe that some alternations can be made which may or may not be considered to be "scientifically necessary," but which will go far toward objections which must be answered.

#### RADIATION RELEASES

Perhaps, the single greatest difficulty facing the AEC is that of the emission of radioactive materials either by accident or by design in the normal operation of a generating plant. An integral part of this difficulty revolves around the safety of the maximum permissible radiation standards, which are currently set at 170 millirems per year. Admittedly, these standards are set by the Federal Radiation Council—FRC—and not the AEC, but the AEC has the power to reduce its plant operational standards below the FRC level. Recently, the AEC amended its rules, and suggested that all nuclear generating plants limit their releases to the lowest practical levels. This action was taken as an alternative to actually reducing the maximum permissible level. The AEC justifies their action of not reducing the maximum permissible level on the grounds that they believe the current FRC standards are absolutely safe and, if any alteration is to be made, they argue that alteration should be in raising and not lowering the maximum level. Further, they contend that lowering their maximum permissible level not only would affront the integrity and accuracy of the FRC but would also be an admission that the existing standard is and has been unsafe. I would suggest that, if those are their fears, then there is no difference between lowering the maximum levels and adopting the as-low-as-practical standard. In either case, you are saying that less radiation is preferable to more, thereby implying that if one could receive no radiation, that would be the optimum.

In fairness, it should be noted that the AEC's nuclear plants are all operating at a level well below the maximum levels, and in many cases at less than 1 percent of those levels. Nevertheless, the fact that they reserve the right to operate at 100 percent of the level disturbs many people, including me.

I would suggest that the concern of the people is not at all irrational, for we, the public, are given such completely contradictory information that some of us can only assume the worse for purposes of self-protection. As an example, Doctors Gofman and Tamplin, noted scientists in the radiation field, have claimed that the AEC, in abiding by the FRC maximum permissible levels, could be causing as many as an additional 32,000 deaths per year from cancer. Since these two men are experts in this area, we cannot help—particularly in light of our underlying fear of nuclear power—but believe that they are at least partially accurate. In response, the Commission, speaking through Commissioner Thompson, declared that the Gofman-Tamplin figures are completely erroneous and that—

(I) instead of having 32,000 cases per year, we probably have statistically less than one extra case of cancer or leukemia as a result of the presence of those nuclear reactors now in operation, under construction, or definitely planned.

What is the public to believe in the face of such completely contradictory statements?

Similarly, many scientists expressed a concern over the danger of tritium being released into the environment from the operation of nuclear powerplants. These experts suggest that we must take all possible precautions to limit the releases because they do represent a danger. The AEC's response? It is expressed in a statement prepared for me by Commissioner Thompson which he entitled "The Hydrogen Forest":

Tritium is a radioactive isotope of hydrogen produced in small quantities during the operation of a nuclear reactor and has been a source of public concern in relation to the use of nuclear power. It is necessary to put the quantity of tritium that could be involved in perspective. Picture the entire United States as a huge forest having one tree on each square foot of land, and each tree having 10,000 leaves. Now, in this forest of a billion, billion leaves, if each leaf were to represent a hydrogen atom, there would also be disbursed throughout this forest about 80 tritium leaves due to cosmic rays and past nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere. The amount of tritium which would be added to the environment due to the operation of all the nuclear reactors planned out through the year 2000 would result in about one additional tritium leaf being added to the nationwide forest of a billion, billion leaves that now contains 80 tritium leaves.

With these types of extreme statements being made on both sides, most of the public is left in limbo and, in choosing between the AEC's version and that of independent scientists, the AEC tends to lose every time. Why? Well, because, first, the public regards the AEC as having something to hide or an interest to protect and, therefore, AEC statements become immediately suspect. Second, by human nature we are all naturally pessimistic and skeptical and, therefore, only too ready to believe the worst.

I do not mean to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that because the public is more likely to respond to emotional overreactions than technical competence that the Commission's competence is suspect, but I do suggest that the AEC should pick one road or the other. If they are accurate when they say that actual emissions are low, then let them lower their standards accordingly. But it seems inappropriate for them to argue that only small amounts of radiation are being released while, at the same time, stubbornly defending standards which are obviously much higher than the releases.

Related to this public distrust are the recent events in Minnesota where that State wished to impose standards on nuclear generating plants considerably more stringent than the AEC's—but standards with which the plant could comply. Apart from the legal considerations about preemption and the jurisdiction of the State, the AEC found itself in the uncomfortable position of opposing Minnesota, which was interpreted, rightly or wrongly, as a position opposed to the preservation of the environment. This type of public relations does not endear the AEC to conservationists, and it is particularly unfortunate since it appears that the AEC did not have to be in the middle of this dispute at all.

The result of the seeming inflexibility of the AEC has led to a public furor which threatens to result in a drastic alteration of the makeup of that agency. In March, then-Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Robert Finch, announced that, as the head of the FRC, he was asking that a complete study be made as to the safety of the existing FRC maximum permissible level standards. Recently, the Nixon administration has been toying with the idea of revamping the AEC to remove its jurisdiction over military programs and perhaps to relieve it of its regulatory functions.

And so, while at one time the AEC was placed on a political pedestal, now that agency is fast losing its immunity from scrutiny; and it all came about, I would suggest, largely because the AEC has appeared to be insensitive to the fears and concerns of the public. A good deal of this public clamor would subside, I feel, if the AEC decided now to voluntarily reduce its radiation standards, thereby showing its desire and willingness to be sensitive to this important issue of radiation dangers.

#### THERMAL POLLUTION

The need for large amounts of cooling waters have led to the siting of nuclear powerplants on the banks of streams and lakes and on the shores of bays and oceans. As these waters are pumped through the cooling system to condense the generated steam, heat is transferred with the result that the temperature of the cooling water increases. This warm water is then discharged back into the source from which it came with the result that a warming of the source takes place. There is great disagreement not only as to the effects of this warm water but also as to the extent of the temperature rise. These unknowns have caused conservationists to oppose the siting of nuclear plants until adequate methods have been devised to return the water at substantially the same temperature as it was originally. Interestingly enough, the AEC agrees that it has the technology to accomplish this task but, because of the increased cost factor and the desire of the AEC—and I believe that it is a valid desire—to keep nuclear-generated electricity competitive with fossil fuel plants, the AEC has been slow to institute programs in this area, thereby becoming a further target for conservation groups.

A fact that is normally overlooked is that nuclear powerplants are not the sole source of thermal pollution. Fossil fuel plants discharge waste heat in the process of generating electricity, albeit at a slightly lower rate than existing nuclear plants.

Existing fossil fuel plants may be a bit more efficient in this respect than existing light water nuclear reactors; however, the new liquid metal fast breeder reactors will supposedly be as efficient as the most advanced fossil fuel plant and will discharge no more waste heat than those plants. In any event, in a fossil fuel plant the heat is discharged both into the air and water—together with many other pollutants which are the products of combustion. This thermal

pollution has not yet come under the attack of conservationists to the degree that their attacks have been directed at the AEC. Thus, the agency finds itself in the uncomfortable position of either having to largely ignore the public demands or to increase the cost of nuclear generated electricity by requiring installation of cooling towers and cooling ponds. The choice is not an easy one, for the large electric companies are looking to that source of power which is least expensive. When the costs are computed not down to the dollar, or to the penny, but to the tenth of a mill, the additional cost of curing thermal pollution becomes a most relevant consideration in convincing these firms to "buy nuclear."

#### WASTE DISPOSAL

An additional problem facing the AEC is that of nuclear waste disposal. The image of thousands of gallons of high-level wastes boiling away in specially built tanks while they slowly decay over hundreds of years is not at all far-fetched. Currently, total high-level nuclear waste—including that from atomic weapons programs—amounts to about 80 million gallons stored in about 200 tanks. The U.S. Public Health Service estimates that, by 1995, the accumulated volume of waste material will come to about 2 billion gallons. The dangers inherent in the storage of this material by conventional methods are obvious and frightening. If, because of sabotage or natural causes, some of this material should find its way into our water sources, significant portions of our population would be exposed to certain death upon consumption of the contaminated water. Already there have been tank failures, but fortunately no serious injury has resulted.

However, the AEC has developed a method of solidifying liquid wastes, thereby reducing the volume dramatically and at the same time making the waste safe for transporting. The present plans are to bury these wastes in salt caverns so that they can dissipate without danger to mankind. Hopefully, this process will be hastened—and that is part of the congressional duty—to so act as to help the AEC remove this threat to our environment.

By way of summary, I would like to tie all of this portion of my remarks together and, hopefully, make some firm suggestions as to the course we should take in the future. My remarks are not intended in any way to be an indictment of the AEC, but if we ignore the problems that agency is facing, and if we overlook that agency's unintentional shortcomings, then we are seriously endangering our national capability to meet the rapidly increasing demand for electricity—a demand which I believe that, given the current state of the art, can only be met by means of nuclear power.

As I have indicated above, I believe that a lowering of the maximum permissible levels not only would help take some public pressure off the AEC, but that such a lowering is justified by both the experience of the AEC that its plants can run well below that standard, and by the public doubts that have been raised concerning the safety of those standards. There should also be stiffer and more ef-

fective pollution regulations on fossil fuel plants—regulations which are at least as comprehensive as those which now fetter nuclear plants. The pollution of the air and water by fossil fuel plants is at least as serious as that of nuclear pollution, and it occurs now on a much larger scale. That pollution is, in its own right, a significant problem which must be dealt with if we are to preserve the quality of our air. It seems incongruous and unfair that we should so regulate nuclear power as to require it to meet stringent environmental and safety standards, while we allow fossil fuel plants to more or less pollute at will. Such equal regulation will allow both types of plants to compete fairly for the consumer's dollar.

Congress should also consider the desirability of dividing the regulatory and the promotional responsibilities of the AEC, and perhaps vest in another agency one or the other of such functions. This unique dual role is one that subjects the AEC to a great deal of public criticism, and adds to the general feeling that the AEC is both judge and jury, responsible only to itself. I am not, at this point, advocating such action, but I do suggest that it should be the subject of congressional scrutiny in the near future.

Finally, the public can assist the AEC and, generally, the cleaner environment effort if it would acknowledge its willingness to pay the necessary incremental costs of having clean power. Those costs are extremely small but, as I have noted, the utilities are very concerned about every small incremental cost. Westinghouse has recently announced that it is able to reduce all radioactive releases from its plants during normal operation to approximately zero, but the costs of this process will of course have to be passed on to the consumer. Similarly, the technology already exists to virtually eliminate thermal pollution, but it costs money to build cooling towers and ponds—and the consumer is going to have to absorb these costs.

Let it be understood: I am not criticizing those who are asking that the AEC act to protect the environment, for theirs is a valid request; however, at the same time, those critics should put the same heat on fossil fuel plants. Their efforts should not be directed at running the AEC out of business, but directed at improving the overall environment and, particularly, the environment as it is affected by electrical generating plants of all types. For it is as unfair and illogical to criticize the AEC and not the fossil fuel plants, as it would be to attack Ford on the issue of air pollution but ignoring, at the same time, General Motors and Chrysler.

Our demand for electrical power cannot be met without the utilization of nuclear power, but that power will never gain public acceptance unless there is a concerted effort by the AEC, the Congress and the public to fairly and rationally look at and solve the problems related to that energy source. It is time, Mr. Chairman, to "cool the rhetoric" and get down to solutions.

#### THE ARTIFICIAL HEART PROGRAM

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me close these already too long remarks by taking note again of the great prospects that lie in the Commission's preliminary work toward the development of a nuclear-powered artificial heart.

Last year, our subcommittee provided the AEC with an unbudgeted \$800,000 increase in funds to carry forward this project but, due to the fiscal situation, such funds were never apportioned—as the term goes—and nothing was accomplished with them. I think this was extremely unfortunate for I see great promise in this concept of a fully implantable artificial heart, powered by nuclear energy in the highest form of its peaceful uses. A device such as this—if it works, and I believe it will—would resolve all those plaguing problems, legal and moral, as well as physical, that have cast doubts upon the long-range feasibility of human heart transplants. For anyone interested—and we all should be—information on this program can be found on pages 788 to 791 of volume 4 of our hearings, and as evidence of its continuing interest in and support of this effort our subcommittee has again provided the Commission with an additional \$800,000, the same as last year, to carry this work forward. I am sure it is my hope and expectation—as well, I believe, as that of the other members of the subcommittee—that, this coming fiscal year, these funds can and will be spent in furtherance of what can become one of the great breakthroughs now remaining on the medical front.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on this bill and on our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KIRWAN).

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I would take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman and the members of the Appropriations Committee for bringing forth an excellent bill. As is inevitable in legislation involving the complex matters in the programs covered by the Public Works for Water Pollution Control, and Power Development and Atomic Energy Commission Appropriation Act, 1971. There are certain aspects which we are not in full accord. Nevertheless, as chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the committee responsible for the authorization of the Federal Water Quality Administration's water pollution control program and the Corps of Engineers' water resource development program, of which programs are included in H.R. 18127, I wish to express my personal appreciation for the kind cooperativeness of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works.

Mr. Chairman, a brief summary of water pollution control legislation to date may be helpful in understanding the issues we have before us today.

Prior to 1955, water pollution control was limited. Until the enactment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1948, the only role the Federal Government had in water pollution control was contained in three acts: The River and Harbor Act of 1899, the Public Health Service Act of 1912, and the Oil Pollution Act of 1924.

The Water Pollution Control Act of 1948 was experimental and limited to a trial period of 5 years but was subsequently extended to June 30, 1956. On July 9, 1956, there was enacted into law the first comprehensive Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Among its provisions were: First, grants to assist States and interstate agencies for water pollution control activities; second, Federal grants of \$50 million a year—up to an aggregate of \$500 million—for the construction of municipal sewage treatment works; and third, a permanent procedure governing Federal abatement action against interstate pollution.

On July 20, 1961, the Federal water pollution control amendments were enacted into law. The amendments, among other things: First, strengthened abatement enforcement of interstate and navigable waters, and second, increased Federal assistance to municipalities for construction of waste treatment works by increasing the grant authorization to \$80 million in 1962, \$80 million in 1963, and \$100 million for each of the fiscal years 1964-67.

The Water Quality Act of 1965, in addition to creating the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, increased the grants to \$150 million for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967. It doubled the dollar limitation on grants for construction of waste treatment works from \$600,000 to \$1.2 million for an individual project, and from \$2.4 to \$4.8 million for a joint project in which two or more communities participate. The removal of the dollar limitation up to a full 30 percent of the project cost was authorized if the State matched the full Federal contribution. It further provided that an increase in the basic grant of an additional 10 percent of the amount of the grant if the project conformed to a comprehensive plan for a metropolitan area.

In 1966 the Congress recognized that while it had commenced an aggressive role for the Federal Government in planning and enforcement by these prior acts, insufficient financial assistance had been offered to the States and the local governments to fight actively water pollution. This had been evidenced by the fact that while sewage treatment plants were being constructed as originally contemplated, they were insufficient to keep up with the problem. Thus, it became clear to the Congress that more tools were needed to fight this battle, and mainly the tools needed consisted of more Federal funds.

Therefore, in 1966, the Congress at the recommendation of the Committee on Public Works enacted the Clean Water Restoration Act. This legislation, which is based on the concept of a Federal-State-local government partnership, authorized \$3.4 billion for construction grants for sewage treatment plants for

the fiscal years 1968-71. The amounts for each year are \$450 million for 1968, \$700 million for 1969, \$1 billion for 1970, and \$1.25 billion for 1971. We did away with the dollar limitation on grants and in all cases the basic amount authorized for a Federal share for a single project or a combined one is 30 percent of the total cost. However, where the State agrees to match 30 percent of the total cost of a project, the Federal share is increased to 50 percent and to 55 percent in metropolitan areas if the project is in conformity with a comprehensive metropolitan plan. Hopefully, this was a major breakthrough in the fight against water pollution.

We all believed, and so advised our constituents, that the authorization for Federal assistance for construction of sewage treatment facilities would result in aiding our towns and cities in meeting the water quality standards which we had required to be established under the Water Quality Act of 1965.

However, we were mistaken. We learned again that authorizing a program does not insure that the program will be funded. Instead of \$450 million in 1968, appropriations were limited to \$203 million. In 1969, instead of \$700 million, appropriations were \$214 million, and in 1970, despite the fact that the Congress authorized \$1 billion as recently as 1966, the administration in its budget request asked for \$214 million. However, the Congress in its wisdom raised this amount to \$800 million.

During this period of high promises and low appropriations, several States, including my home State of Maryland, in good faith and in full reliance of the promises held out by the Federal Government geared up and proceeded to carry out its part of the bargain. The State of Maryland committed itself to constructing sewage treatment works in an amount approximating \$150 million. Over \$25 million of what should have been Federal funds has been expended by the State. In all the State of Maryland has outstanding reimbursables exceeding \$60 million. I do not intend to convey the impression that other States have not also gone ahead with planning and construction notwithstanding the apparent failure of the Federal Government to meet its obligations. I have been advised that there is presently outstanding reimbursables amounting to some \$894 million. Thus, instead of assisting those States which were willing to move forward, we have in fact burdened them further.

H.R. 18127 attempts to remedy this situation, at least partially. I am pleased to report that through the cooperation of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, we were able to jointly work out language which I believe will be helpful to the States which moved forward to their monetary detriment. This was accomplished in this bill by specifically allocating \$200 million of the total \$1 billion appropriation recommendation on the basis of eligibility of the States for reimbursement toward the Federal share of such projects as they have prefunded under the provisions of section 8(c) of

the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. In addition, it was agreed that grant moneys not obligated out of the amounts allocated to the States under the existing formula by the end of the fiscal year, rather than after 18 months, should thereupon be reallocated in accordance with present procedures, thereby speeding up the process of getting the grant money where the need exists and where it can be best utilized. This also has been included in H.R. 18127. There had been some proposals which would have provided for reimbursement, but would have assured Federal funding for new projects in future years. These plans were unacceptable.

I wish to make it crystal clear that I am in agreement with this proposal.

I do have one major reservation. It is my firm conviction—and I have so stated on many occasions—that the appropriations for fiscal year 1971 should be the full amount authorized—\$1.25 billion and not the proposed \$1 billion. I further believe that the reimbursement portion should be raised from \$200 million to \$250 million.

In the committee's report, it is noted that there is an estimated carryover unobligated balance of \$440 million, which when combined with this year's recommendation of \$1 billion totals \$1.44 billion for construction of waste treatment works to abate water pollution problems. I regret that the Federal Water Quality Administration has not been able to pump this unobligated money into the program at a faster rate.

However, I am totally convinced that if the additional \$250 million were appropriated it could be beneficially utilized. I am not at all certain that it is necessary to seek out and place blame for the delays, but I am convinced that it is necessary to appropriate the needed funds and put them to work so that we may protect and preserve our environment.

Mr. Chairman, I would also express my appreciation to the Appropriations Committee for its allowance of \$1,330,000 for the Chesapeake Bay Basin model study, an increase of \$1 million over the administration's budget request. The increase allowed provides the full Corps of Engineers' capability during fiscal year 1971 for design of the shelter and the model, field data collection, studies, and initiation of procurement of model instrumentation. The committee was most kind to my requests for additional funds in excess of administration's budget recommendation which I made at the hearings held by the Public Works Subcommittee in May and by letter dated June 9, 1970, to the subcommittee's distinguished chairman, Mr. KIRWIN.

I had the privilege of introducing the legislation for the Chesapeake Bay Basin model study which was included in the River and Harbor Act of 1965. This study consists of a complete investigation and study of water utilization control of the Chesapeake Bay Basin, including but not limited to navigation, fisheries, flood control, control of noxious weeds, water pollution control, water quality control, beach erosion, and recreation.

A hydraulic model of the Chesapeake Bay Basin and associated technical center was authorized to be constructed, operated, and maintained in the State of Maryland for this purpose. The model and center are to be utilized by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government, as well as the States of Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania in connection with any research, investigation, or study to be carried on by them on any aspect of the Chesapeake Bay Basin.

This study is comprehensive estuarine study, multidisciplinary in scope, encompassing engineering and the physical, chemical, biological, and social sciences. The first year of the study, fiscal year 1967, was used in developing broad concepts and constraints for this study for unprecedented scope and magnitude.

The second year was used for a more detailed evaluation of procedures for accomplishing the study, for interagency coordination, and for a public hearing at which the views of affected local interests were obtained. The analysis was reevaluated by the Corps of Engineers in fiscal year 1969 in response to a request by the House Appropriations Committee with the objective of reducing the cost, including the model, the Corps of Engineers' analysis response to that request included consideration of reducing the physical size of the model, substituting a mathematical model for a hydraulic model, and reducing the scope of the resource study.

It was found by the corps that any of the less costly programs considered would fail to comply with the intent of the original authorization and would not insure success of the study. The corps also further found that the total cost for the study would be \$15 million and not the \$6 million originally authorized and estimated. Thus, the corps has estimated it will need an additional \$9 million to complete the study.

On June 4, 1970, the Congress passed and sent to the President H.R. 15166, the River Basin Monetary Authorization Act of 1970. This legislation included a provision, which I again had the privilege of sponsoring authorizing to completion by the Corps of Engineers the Chesapeake Bay Basin comprehensive study in an estimated additional amount of \$9 million.

There are many urgent problems which challenge the environment of Chesapeake Bay which makes it necessary that this study be accelerated and completed as early as possible. Waste disposal is a pressing problem. The Baltimore-Washington urban complex had a population of approximately 3.8 million people in 1960, a number which is expected to double in 25 years. Little study has been done concerning the intricate relationship between exploding urbanization and the estuarine environment. The Washington area places 8 million pounds of phosphorus and 25 million pounds of nitrogen in the Potomac River annually. These quantities are estimated to double in 25 years. The Patuxent River receives the wastes of 78,000 people and has lost 10 species of fish. The rapidly expanding rate of urbanization

provides the additional threats of increased thermal loads and other very hard to manage compounds. There are numerous other inflows, the invasion of noxious weeds, land and shore erosion, and silt inflows as a function of increased urban development, agricultural activity, and navigation projects.

This comprehensive study, when completed, will project economic development within the bay area and the consequent resource demands. It will serve as a viable management guide to maintaining the environmental integrity of the Chesapeake Bay while encouraging beneficial resource use and enjoyment.

Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill to provide funds for flood control, navigation, and other essential public works, and congratulate the committee on its work in these vital fields.

The committee has dealt generously with Oklahoma and with the great Arkansas River project, and we in the Oklahoma delegation are most appreciative of the consideration afforded our State.

Thanks to this great committee, we are now in the home stretch of construction of locks and dams essential to navigation of the Arkansas River, and barges will be traveling up the Arkansas and Verdigris River channels by December of this year.

1970 is the year the great dream of navigation will finally come true for Oklahoma, and realization of that dream would not have been possible without the full support of this committee and this House.

I appreciate very much the remarks made earlier by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS), and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) in tribute to our beloved colleague, Mike KIRWAN of Ohio.

Chairman KIRWAN is without doubt the greatest champion of water resource development serving in this House in the 20th century, and Oklahomans will always be grateful to him for his stalwart support of Oklahoma water development programs.

There are many others on this great committee who have made a great contribution to our Nation's water resource development—and I am grateful to each of them—but no one has surpassed Mike KIRWAN in either leadership or statesmanship in the advancement of this cause.

We are going to miss Mike KIRWAN in the 92d Congress—and in the Congresses to follow.

Oklahomans will never forget him.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 18127, the public works appropriations bill and urge its prompt passage by the House. Despite the disfavor public works have found in some quarters of our society, they remain the most effective means available to the Federal Government to affect the restoration of the Nation's lands and water resources. And while the appropriations are not nearly as generous as I would personally have them, I must say that the Committee on Appropria-

tions performed well under rather severe budget limitations.

In my own district, these appropriations will provide \$1 million toward construction of the Red River Waterway, \$1.9 million toward emergency bank protection on the Red, and \$100,000 for planning of levees and bank stabilization on the Red, one of the most neglected rivers in the United States. The bill will also provide \$15,000 for examinations and surveys on Bayous Rapides, Boeuf, Cocodrie, and outlets in my district, as well as \$103,000 for the Old and Atchafalaya Rivers control project. Funds in the amount of \$3.4 million are provided for Mississippi River levees, \$200,000 for construction and planning on Old River, \$120,000 for the south bank of the Red, \$6.1 million for the Atchafalaya Basin, and \$32.6 million for channel improvements on the Mississippi River.

These funds are provided largely for projects which are already underway. Little or nothing is provided for new improvements to these waterways. I am pleased that the bill contemplates continuation of these projects in Louisiana, but I am afraid that they only maintain work already planned and do nothing to increase the rate of progress conditions demand.

It is my hope that our fiscal situation will soon permit us to move forward on the great number of deserving projects throughout the Nation. We cannot for long afford to stand still in our programs of land and water development.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. Chairman, along with many of my colleagues, I have become increasingly concerned with the growing environmental crisis in our country. We are faced with the hazards of pollution on several fronts. Our lakes and rivers, once our most cherished assets, are virtually unusable, and have become ever-increasing health hazards. In our large urban areas, the ominous threat of polluted air is no longer a possibility, but an undeniable reality. My own city of Chicago has recently enacted an ordinance which will require both Government and industry to adhere to strict antipollution guidelines. I am in full agreement with my colleagues who seek to amend the public works appropriation bill to allow for full funding of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Considering the gravity of the existing situation, we cannot approve less.

I also want to commend the work of my distinguished colleagues who sit on the Appropriations Committee. The report on this legislation shows their acute awareness of the need to combat our environmental problems as swiftly and efficiently as possible. The increased funding by the committee was a step in the right direction. I also want to commend them for increasing the grants for waste treatment plants, and for striving for efficient new means of grant allocations. The bill before us today, although a significant increase over past appropriations for pollution control, is no guarantee of any immediate solutions. But with

the \$1.25 billion appropriation for clean water, I feel it can be a very significant step.

Mr. PICKLE, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this opportunity to address the House membership concerning two projects now underway in the 10th Congressional District of Texas.

First, let me say that I appreciate the diligent effort the Committee on Appropriations invested in reporting to the House a well-planned and comprehensive program of public works, and I commend to you the result of their efforts, the bill which we consider now in this Chamber. The committee did not heed all recommendations, but perhaps this is good. They must view each project in the light of the overall welfare of our Nation and must allocate a limited supply of funds among those projects most worthy. I hold the highest respect for their judgment in these matters.

I am pleased to report that the committee saw sufficient reason to deem the Palmetto Bend reclamation project and the San Gabriel—a tributary of the Brazos River—Army Corps of Engineers flood control project worthy of appropriations for fiscal 1971. The committee moved the San Gabriel project into the construction start stage, and authorized for the Palmetto Bend Dam project \$100,000 for preconstruction planning to be added to the \$200,000 allocated last year but frozen by Executive order.

Mr. Chairman, the approval by the committee of the continuance of these projects is evidence of their confidence the projects should be kept alive and rolling in the framework of national public works. Moreover, both are crucial to the areas which they affect directly.

Williamson County suffered disastrous back-to-back floods in 1957 and 1959. The damages ran well over \$3 million and our rural economy was damaged for several years. The San Gabriel flood control program will eliminate this potential for future disaster. The project stood ready for construction in 1968. Sufficient land has now been purchased. The San Gabriel Reservoirs have been authorized for nearly two decades, longer than most others in the United States. The project offers a benefit to cost ratio of 1.7 to 1. Moreover, the Corps of Engineers, the Brazos River Authority of Texas, and the Governor of Texas are firm in their commitment to this project. It would be a disaster in its own right to bring this project so far along only to let it die or unduly linger here.

The Palmetto Bend Dam was authorized in 1968 after 20 years of hard work and planning. As a result of these years of effort the project now has an unprecedented breadth of support among all levels of government. Presently, the Lavaca-Navidad River Authority, the Jackson County Commissioners Court, the Texas Water Development Board, and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation are all agreed on this project. To obtain initial authorization of the project, the citizens of Jackson County voted more than 2 to 1 in favor of taxes to pay for bonds for the project. The Texas Water Devel-

opment Board agreed to participate in the project up to nearly \$22 million—significantly higher than the estimated Federal participation of \$12 million. Planners have reported that the yields of the reservoir will be needed to meet the local water needs of the year 2020 or much sooner. Also such a reservoir should insure against the recurrence of the disastrous events of the early fifties when drought took a high economic toll. Further, this project has been specifically included in a comprehensive water plan proposed by the Texas Water Development Board with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation designed to serve the needs of Texas and New Mexico for 50 years. This project is worthy. Enthusiasm is high. But there is always a danger of stagnation if that enthusiasm is not put to work soon. This project certainly deserves action now.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge the continued support of these two vital projects, the San Gabriel flood-control project and the Palmetto Bend reclamation project, and I want to officially thank the committee for their consideration. I know they gave each request throughout the Nation their full attention and did what they could to keep us on target. The members of the committee—on a bipartisan basis—were considerate of the groups which appeared before them. The members had to sit in long sessions and hear testimony which often was detailed and involved. Yet they were considerate, courteous, and thoughtful. The reception they gave to citizens who testified was warm and understanding, and the members made those citizens proud of their Government.

And, Mr. Chairman, may I also express my appreciation to the very excellent professional staff of the House who know what they are doing, and who operate their part of the committee work in a highly professional and efficient manner.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 18127, the public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971.

For 12 years, I have worked for flood-control protection essential to my area, the Fifth District of Connecticut. In large part through my efforts, a complex of flood control dams, reservoirs, dikes, and pumping stations, so necessary for the safety of our people and property, has neared the peak of completion. Further funds are necessary to reach that peak.

The 1971 public works bill provides for three flood control projects in the Fifth District of Connecticut. I can attest to the importance these projects hold for the people of the Derby, Trumbull Pond Reservoir, and Ansonia-Derby areas. These programs are sorely needed. Of the total \$10,050,000 in this bill designated for Connecticut flood control, \$8,550,000 is earmarked for Fifth District planning and construction. Passage of this bill would mark the culmination of successful cooperation in this field between myself, local officials, the Public Works and Appropriations Committees, the Army Corps of Engineers, and my colleagues in the House during the last 12 years.

H.R. 18127 further supports in tangible form the objective of restoring and maintaining a clean environment. As an early advocate of national efforts to combat water pollution, I support the bill's direct appropriation of \$1 billion to fund construction of waste treatment works. This sum is authorized by the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966, a law which I sponsored in the House. Included with this would be a carryover of \$440 million which would make a total available of \$1.44 billion.

We must more than ever be sensitive to our ecological needs, the preservation of our open space, and the protection and control of our rivers. The \$1 billion appropriation in this bill for clean water restoration represents a \$200 million increase over last year's bill—\$640 million with the carryover—a forward step in environmental control.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I speak in support of the Appropriations Committee in its stated opposition to the inclusion of funds for the Dickey-Lincoln power project in Maine. I have opposed this project in the past as being inefficient and unnecessary. In fact, the House has rejected Dickey-Lincoln appropriations on five separate rollcall votes in the last 4 years. Originally estimated at \$300 million, eventual project costs would probably exceed \$500 million. One study predicts that future power requirements in Boston and Maine could be satisfied at one-fifth the Dickey-Lincoln costs through steam and pumped storage plants. Furthermore, Dickey-Lincoln's power could not be available before 1980. In addition this hardly seems to be the time to add a commitment of half a billion dollars to an overburdened Federal Budget. For these reasons, I cannot view Dickey-Lincoln as a practical means of providing power.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, about the best news for America in this decade has been the explosion of interest in improving and protecting our environment. It is good news because it can bring us pure air and water, needed national parks and wildlife preservation. It could, however, become a curse instead of good news if, in hysteria, we respond by prohibiting every needed highway, canal, and job-producing industrial opportunity.

The poorly documented, and sometimes completely untruthful, attacks made by some people against the Cross-Florida Barge Canal present a case in point.

I am pleased to support the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works recommendation of \$6 million for continued construction for the canal in fiscal year 1971. I am deeply grateful to the committee for its firm support for the canal. The committee feels the canal should move ahead, and offered its full support for the project in the report on the funding bill, H.R. 18127. I include here the statement on the canal from the committee report—91-1219:

Cross-Florida Barge Canal, Florida—The committee has included in the bill the \$6,000,000, including carryover funds, proposed in the budget to continue construction of

the project. The committee has given serious consideration to the concerns that have been expressed as to the possible ecological and hydrological adverse effects that may result from the project. However, the committee does not feel that it would be warranted, in the light of the current facts available, in delaying construction of the project which was started in 1964 and is now about 30 percent complete. The reservoir and pool preparation on the project are 43 percent complete; construction of the dams, 75 percent complete; and the required locks, 50 percent complete. A total of \$52.7 million has been allocated to the project to date.

The project has a very favorable benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.4 to 1. Since authorization, the project has been subject to two special studies to examine to economic justification of its construction, including an independent study by a nationally recognized consulting firm. These studies include comments from other agencies having expertise in the fields of biology, natural esthetics, and environmental matters. The design and construction of the project have been fully coordinated with Federal and State agencies to insure that the environmental aspect of the project area are preserved and enhanced. The U.S. Geological Survey has recently completed a detailed study of the geohydrology of the canal and the Ocala area, which indicated that the proposed canal would not adversely affect the quantity or quality of the water coming from Silver Springs. Its study also disclosed that the impact of the barge canal on ground water supply will be negligible.

In reference to the fish and wildlife, it is realized that with the construction of any new reservoirs, habitats change and some plants and animals are reduced but other plants and animals appear and prosper in the new environment. The new reservoirs will provide many thousands of areas of new habitat for a wide variety of sport and commercial species. The committee believes that studies that have been made support conclusions that while some short term losses will result, the overall effect will be a long term gain in the environmental quality.

Considering, therefore, the status of the construction and the need for the project, the committee recommends that the construction work continue and that every effort continue to be made to minimize any adverse effects on the environment, ecology, and fish and wildlife in the area. Any additional studies would appear to be a duplication of previous work and would delay realization of the essential project benefits.

This canal is being constructed as an important public transportation facility, just like a highway. The purpose of the canal is to move bulk goods at a cheap rate for the benefit of all Americans, not just a few. It will cut the costs of shipping goods from the producing areas of the west to the consuming areas of the east. It has been found economically justified for these reasons alone.

Even more important than that, however, is the defense value which this canal gives our country by allowing safe transportation of oil in time of war from oil-producing areas in the west to oil-consuming areas in the east. This is in support of both the industry and the military oil uses, which are both necessary to our country's survival in time of war. The alternatives of rail, ocean shipping, or pipeline would be very much more expensive, if they could be obtained at all.

My primary support for the Cross-Florida Barge Canal, as a senior member

of the House Armed Services Committee and chairman of the Seapower Subcommittee, is based on its national defense value. During World War II, ships with a replacement value of \$1 billion were lost off the coast of Florida due to German submarine attacks. The threat today from the Soviet submarine fleet is even more awesome and increasing in intensity in the Atlantic Ocean. Castro's Cuba, 90 miles from Florida, and the always dangerous Latin American situation make the canal more important to national security in 1970 than it was in 1942 when the Congress authorized the canal for national defense reasons.

Although the canal may not in the current tight military budget be a thing that the Department of Defense would expect to build itself, for it has never built a canal like this from defense funds; nevertheless, the defense value is in fact tremendous. And this defense value is reason enough to build the canal, even if it were not otherwise justified on an economic basis, which it manifestly is.

During the course of consideration of the location of the canal, dating back to 1826, some 29 different routes were studied. Based upon those studies the present alignment was authorized in 1942. At the same time authorization was granted, construction of a pipeline across the State of Florida was undertaken to relieve the oil and fuel shortage on the eastern seaboard as a result of the wartime situation. I mention this since during the testimony of Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, War Department, before the Senate Committee on Commerce, June 30, 1942, he stated in testifying in regard to the canal:

The value in time of war of an improved through inland waterway from Port Isabel (Texas) to Trenton (New Jersey) with a minimum depth of 12 feet, is believed sufficient to warrant construction of these improvements.

The canal is not a conservation project, although it will greatly enhance the outdoor recreational values along its 107-mile route. It is a transportation facility, one-third complete with \$52.7 million already appropriated by Congress, which is fully economically justified. The taxpayers of Florida have matched funds with the taxpayers of the districts along the canal to furnish \$12 million on rights of way. It will carry over a million tons of traffic annually when it is open.

Luckily, the Cross-Florida Barge Canal will greatly improve outdoor recreation as an incidental value and will, in my opinion, have substantial conservation values far exceeding any public-assisted highway or railroad right-of-way. The canal project will produce 36 new public recreation areas with 254 additional miles of shoreline and 35,000 acres of surface water. The U.S. Wildlife Service predicts a gain of 78,200 annual man-days for fishing and there will be 296 more acres for picnicking and camping, along with a 300-foot-wide collar of land around each reservoir for exclusive public use for camping, picnicking, and just plain enjoying the wonders of nature.

There is no reason to believe that, had

not the Cross-Florida Barge Canal been authorized and funded by the Congress, the portion of the State it will traverse would be preserved in its natural state. There was no such planning or law setting aside the canal area from the deep water at Jacksonville on the St. Johns River on the east to the Gulf of Mexico near Yankeetown on the west for conservation or preservation. As a matter of fact, the Oklawaha River, where two reservoirs will be constructed along the canal route, has been improved by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for 80 years. The work on the Oklawaha River first started in 1890 at the request of local people there. Since that time, some seven different projects have taken place along the river, which before these improvements was so winding, snag infested, and dangerous that it was seldom used by anyone. In 1960, over \$25 million in flood damage to homes and property was caused along the river. Improvements have been made to protect against such catastrophes. Canal construction is not destroying the Oklawaha River or any other area. Instead, the river will be further changed to include the two large water improvements. These improvements when completed will be useful manmade lakes of greater water extent than the river. Some persons have urged that these bodies of water might become polluted from barge traffic; but, these bodies of water are water reserves to supply the locks and are not likely to ever receive any pollutants at all.

The Cross-Florida Barge Canal is important to national defense. It is economically justified and it will add to outdoor recreation value. It should be completed as soon as possible for all America.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I note also in the committee's report and in the bill the Appropriations Committee has before us today the strong support of the liquid metal fast breeder program. I commend the committee for its attitude and support of this critical effort. The development of the fast breeder is the priority effort in the Nation's civilian power program. The only solution we now see to our long-range energy problems in the development of the breeder reactor. If we are successful, we will attain a virtually limitless supply of energy. We must concentrate our effort in the civilian power field on the development of this reactor system. We are all cognizant of the budget restrictions which have been imposed on the funding of many of our programs. Accordingly, our efforts on such important projects as the breeder program must be planned and executed as efficiently as possible in order that we obtain maximum benefits from the available funds.

Last Saturday I met with Mr. Shaw, the director of the AEC's reactor development program; and with the top management of the AEC's Argonne National Laboratory to review the effort on the liquid metal fast breeder reactor program.

One of the primary reasons I visited with the management of the AEC's Argonne Laboratory last Saturday was to obtain assurance that a concerted and

well-planned approach to the effort on the breeder is utilized. The Argonne Laboratory has been assigned a major portion of the effort in the breeder program. Accordingly, in my discussions with Dr. Duffield, the Director of the Laboratory and his colleagues, I made a special point of the fact that this work must be given priority attention. I stressed the importance of assigning the best qualified people to this program. We must have people who are both professionally and personally committed to the expeditious and successful completion of the work.

I want to assure my colleagues that I plan to continue to "ride herd" on this program since it is so vitally important to the Nation. I want to again commend the committee for its enthusiastic support of the breeder reactor program.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity, on behalf of the residents of northwestern Minnesota, to express my appreciation to my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, and particularly the members of the Public Works Subcommittee, for including in this bill \$150,000 to allow the commencement of construction on the Roseau River project located in northwestern Minnesota.

The residents of this area have been battling against the extraordinary flood conditions that exist along the Roseau River since the beginning of this century. They have invested a great deal of effort and money in this effort over the years. However, it has become clear that the Federal project, envisioned in this bill, is necessary to obtain a complete victory in this battle against the virtually annual flooding that occurs along the Roseau River.

Our approval of the funds for this project means a great deal to the residents of northwestern Minnesota for it signals the opportunity to bring an end to the devastation that has continually hampered their efforts to make a better life for themselves and their families.

Mr. BROZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of the public works and Atomic Energy Commission Appropriations bill.

This legislation is particularly vital in my district, where both flood control and better utilization of water resources are critical problems.

In June of 1965 one of the most damaging floods in recent history occurred in Colorado when Plum Creek and the South Platte River, normally rather placid streams, were turned into a veritable wall of water by thunderstorms of incredible intensity.

Damage topped half a billion dollars and 13 lives were lost.

From this tragedy came a resolve on the part of both the people of Colorado and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to bring flood control not only to Plum Creek but other tributaries of the South Platte River which are subject to storms such as that of 1965.

Work was begun on the previously authorized Chatfield dam and reservoir. The project now is in the construction phase, and I am pleased that \$13.2 mil-

lion—which is just enough to maintain the corps' schedule—will be provided.

In 1968 Congress authorized construction of the Mount Carbon Dam and Reservoir on another notorious killer among the South Platte tributaries, Bear Creek. The bill we are considering would provide \$400,000 for advanced design on this much-needed project.

As I indicated earlier, development of water resources is equally vital to my district, and accordingly I am pleased that the Bureau of Reclamation would be provided with \$139,000 for continued investigation of potential water utilization projects in northern Colorado.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I note that the Appropriations Committee is supporting the funding of the Human Radiobiology Facility for Argonne National Laboratory. I strongly concur in the committee's support of this project and commend the committee for its foresight in including this project in its bill.

This facility will house the newly created Center for Human Radiobiology. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy studied the need for this facility in depth at a number of hearings. The work to be performed in this facility is aimed at obtaining vital data on the effects of radiation on humans. Data can be obtained from humans who were exposed to radiation 40 to 50 years ago as a result of uninformed, and at that period, careless use of radium. Some of these exposures occurred as a result of what was believed at the time to be a therapeutic use of naturally radioactive materials and others as a consequence of careless industrial use of radium in applications such as painting of watch dials.

The purpose of this project is to provide a facility in which we can study the effects of radiation and to use the data in setting future standards for exposure of humans to radiation. We need this valuable data to help insure that never again will instances of such human exposure take place.

Last Saturday I had the opportunity of meeting with the Director of Argonne National Laboratory, Dr. Robert Duffield. He outlined for me his plans for proceeding with this facility when congressional action is consummated. A great deal of thought has been given to the construction and utilization of this facility which will assure that our Nation obtains maximum results with the funds we are appropriating today.

Last year I learned there was a group of patients at the Elgin State Mental Hospital who had been treated with radium compounds in the 1930's. Since I thought that the additional information which could be gained from these people, who had unnecessarily been exposed, could assist in guiding our judicial use of radiation in the future I asked the director of the Department of Public Health of Illinois if he could cooperate with the scientists who were doing the work on human radiobiology by making available to them the data on these patients. I was most pleased to learn during my discussions last Saturday with scien-

tists from the Argonne National Laboratory that the patients from the Elgin Mental Hospital are being studied for the valuable additional data this can provide in our work.

I plan to follow the work of the Human Radiobiology Facility at the Argonne National Laboratories, and I specifically plan to stay in touch with Dr. Robert Rowland, of Argonne, who is in charge of this work.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation before us today contains funding for a small, but very important, project in my district.

In this bill is an item calling for an expenditure of \$839,000 for the completion of a bridge over the J. Percy Priest Reservoir.

When the reservoir was impounded some 3 to 4 years ago it left isolated a section of Metropolitan Nashville-Davidson County with no access by land to it from the rest of the county. This also brought an isolation from urban services such as police and fire protection as well as ambulance service and commercial services.

The city of Nashville and the State of Tennessee immediately recognized the need of the area and authorized expenditures for the construction of the piers for a bridge as well as a road connecting the bridge with two interstate highways. The piers for the bridge were constructed before the impoundment of the reservoir and the rights of way for the road have been secured. All that remains is for the actual construction of the bridge. The funds in this bill will make this possible and permit work to get underway in the very near future.

At this time I would like to express my appreciation to my distinguished colleague from Tennessee, Mr. EVINS, who, realizing the need for this bridge, guided the money for it through the hearing and executive sessions of the Appropriations Committee. To him, as well as the other members of the committee, I am very much indebted and even more appreciative.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, today we are at a crossroads in the field of electric power. The Nation demands more and more electricity as its population grows and its per capita consumption of electricity increases. In the year 2000, experts predict that we will require eight times as much electricity as we now consume. But it is becoming more and more difficult for us to answer our power needs through conventional methods of power generation. Though the burning of fossil fuels, that is coal and oil, is now providing our Nation with 90 percent of its electricity, the supply of those fuels is becoming depleted. We are being forced to use lower grade fuels, making conventional methods of power production more expensive. The depletion of fossil fuels makes the future of our chemical and drug industries less secure, as coal and oil are irreplaceable to them.

Because of the problems created by continued consumption of fossil fuels, the Nation is now beginning to turn to atomic energy for its power needs. While elec-

tricity from nuclear sources provides only 2 percent of our power needs at this point in time, it is estimated that in the year 2000 nuclear energy will have to fulfill from one-third to one-half of that need.

But before we plunge into a frantic effort to increase our atomic powerplant capacity, we must be wary of the harmful side effects of atomic powerplants. Because we face a power problem, we must not panic and hastily institute a quick solution. If we do, we may find that 10 years from now that we have created more problems than we have solved. The danger of a quick and hasty solution in the nuclear power field is aggravated by a number of unique and grave factors. Among these factors:

First. The harmful effects of using nuclear energy are irreversible. Whereas, with the necessary time and resources we can correct a failing in a space mission or clean up a polluted river, we cannot remove radiation from a human being or his environment once it is placed there. Radioactive materials that we create in powerplants remain deadly for 50,000 years; they cannot be destroyed.

Second. Radiation poisoning of humans is a cumulative process. The radiation that man is exposed to will be passed on to his children and his children's children. Any individual may receive a "small harmless" dose of radiation. But three generations, and three "small harmless" doses later, that individual's great grandchildren could suffer debilitating effects because of genetic alteration of his parents. We have only learned this hard lesson recently. For 20 years, no long-lasting ill effects were observed in those who survived the holocaust at Hiroshima. But the offspring of those who survived the tragedy are now exhibiting greatly increased rates of leukemia and bone cancer.

Third. We know too little of nuclear radiation's dangerous effects. The unresolved questions concerning the relationship between the environment and nuclear energy include:

What is the permissible level of radioactive emissions that may enter the atmosphere without harming humans genetically or somatically?

What is a tolerable dose of radiation?

What is the effect of several small doses of radiation over a prolonged period of time?

What are the best ways of disposing radioactive wastes?

Should reactors be built in populated areas; and if so, should those reactors be built underground?

How is radiation transmitted from one generation to the next?

How does radiation accumulate in our food cycle?

What are the effects of thermal emissions into the water and air?

Eminent scientists have argued different sides of each of these questions, and they have not reached agreement. All scientists do agree on one point, however: We do not have nearly sufficient information about the effects of radiation on human beings.

Fourth. Past experience cannot be relied upon in planning future actions. If present plans continue, by the year 2000 the number of reactors producing electricity will increase by 10,000 percent. The radiation hazard will increase accordingly and so will the chance for accident. Yet we cannot afford to have even one major accident in a nuclear reactor; it may kill thousands and even hundreds of thousands of innocent citizens. The chilling thought of even one accident occurring and the massive and unprecedented increase in the number of reactors make past experience an inadequate guide on which to base the future.

These four unique situations make future investigations imperative before we expand our atomic power capacity. We must continually remember that the irradiation process is irreversible, that radiation poisoning is cumulative, that our knowledge in this area is limited, and that past experience is no guide for the future.

I urge the Atomic Energy Commission, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the Congress not to lose sight of the dangers of radiation in their enthusiasm for the benefits of cheap and plentiful power. If, in their haste, they do ignore these dangers, they may accomplish subtly, and in times of peace, what this generation has feared would come by war: radioactive contamination of our earth.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, 2 days ago, June 22, marked the 29th anniversary of the first legislation providing for Federal participation in flood control on a nationwide basis.

Three decades ago we recognized that the Federal Government has a responsibility to provide a nationwide program of flood control.

There is hardly an area of the United States which enjoys immunity from some form of flooding.

Each spring, the Central States along the great rivers of this country are threatened by rising waters. And, in the fall, the coastal areas of the United States are prey to hurricanes brewing in the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico.

Three decades ago we recognized the responsibility of our Government to protect our citizens from the dangers of flooding. We charged the Corps of Engineers with the job of constructing a system to mitigate the loss of life and property in flooding, wherever it might occur.

Today there are about 1,000 authorized projects under this legislation. The lives and safety of thousands of American citizens are tied to these projects.

Those of us in New Orleans and on the gulf coast in general, are particularly dependent upon these projects. They have saved countless lives and millions of dollars worth of property. But the job of protecting our people—and people in other parts of our country—is not yet finished.

Hurricane Betsy, which struck the city of New Orleans in the fall of 1965, and Hurricane Camille, which struck the gulf coast last August, took terrible tolls in

lives and property. But there are many people whose lives and property were never in jeopardy because of hurricane protection and flood control projects completed or nearing completion in our area.

For this reason I intend to support this bill and I urge all my colleagues to do so also.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the committee report this year indicates that without a doubt the "environmental decade" is underway. The emphasis is not on exploiting our resources, but on conserving them. This change in focus comes none too soon—had we waited until 1980 for the inauguration of the environmental decade, it would almost certainly have been too late. As it is, we have a monumental job ahead of us.

Of all the environmental problems we face as a Nation, pollution of our natural water resources is among the most serious. Fortunately for us, the technological remedies for most of our water pollution problems are in hand. What is required now is the will and the resources to get on with the job.

I am particularly concerned about pollution of the waters of the Great Lakes. The Great Lakes are the Nation's greatest single water resource. Millions of people live and depend upon their waters for their drinking water, for their bathing beaches, for fishing and boating, for transportation and commerce. To my mind in many respects, Lake Michigan is the single most valuable asset of the Chicago area. It must be conserved. When one views what has happened to Lake Erie with its visible evidence of a dying condition, we know that we must prevent a similar fate befalling Lake Michigan or any of the other Great Lakes.

Ecologists tell us that lakes come and go—that lakes are not immortal—that they live and die just like any other organism. The problem is that man's pollution of our lakes and rivers has shortened their useful lives. The natural life span of Lake Michigan might be expected to be many hundreds of years, but pollution threatens to shorten it to a decade or so. Unless we move to do everything we can to preserve the lake, to protect it from the ravages of pollution, by the turn of the century we could possibly expect that it will no longer support life. This legislation will help to lengthen the life span of Lake Michigan, and that is why it has my support.

The appropriation in this bill for grants for the construction of waste treatment plants will help maintain and improve Lake Michigan. Chicago already has some of the best waste treatment facilities in the Nation. This bill provides the kind of broad-ranging commitment to municipal water pollution control that will be necessary to sustain and improve the quality of Chicago's water resources.

This bill also addresses itself to another pollution problem that is especially important to those who live on the shores of Lake Michigan—the problem of thermal and radioactive pollution from nu-

clear powerplants. In the next 10 years no less than seven nuclear power generating plants are planned for the shores of Lake Michigan. It is essential that we learn more about how to manage the waste heat and waste radioactive materials that will be the byproducts of those plants. The inclusion in this year's AEC budget of some \$71 million for research of environmental questions represents an encouraging change from the Commission's previous hands-off attitude toward pollution, and, hopefully, will point the way to solving the problem of balancing our energy needs with those of the natural environment.

There is another problem which must command our attention. In the past, Lake Michigan has had to absorb polluted dredgings from various lakefront harbors as the price for providing inland ports. The problem is being resolved by depositing the dredgings in contained disposal areas—as of today approximately 90 percent of the Corps of Engineers dredgings will be disposed of in such areas, rather than being dumped in the lake. But we must not be satisfied until all polluted dredgings are banned from the lake. We have long since passed the point where we could tolerate any further deterioration of Lake Michigan. Even 10 percent of the polluted dredgings constitute an unacceptable addition to the lake, and the sooner the Corps of Engineers understands that, the better. Present plans call for the elimination of dumping by March 1973. I would hope that the job can be accomplished much sooner than that and will do all that I can to see that it is.

I support this bill as one means of extending the life of Lake Michigan, the Great Lakes, all the natural water resources of our Nation. It is a good bill, even though it is by no means the last word in pollution control. It is the least we can do this year. Unless we increase our commitment, our waterways will not be reclaimed. We have to do better than that if we are to stem the tide and preserve our water resources for the generations that will follow us.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, I urge House approval of the public works appropriations measure for fiscal 1971, although I have doubts about the sufficiency of funds for construction grants for waste treatment works. According to the assessment of the Water Resources Council, based on a projected population of about 468 million by the year 2020, capital outlays required for waste treatment, sanitary sewers, and water cooling requirements are estimated at \$20 billion for the 5-year period of 1969-73.

In order to arrive at a proper figure, we must consider the future needs of the Nation and the best way to insure a sufficiency of clean water. The high priority accorded water pollution control and abatement must not diminish.

Today's measure would provide \$1 billion for construction grants for waste treatment works for fiscal 1971, in addition to an estimated \$440 million carry-over of unobligated balances. And 80 percent of the \$1 billion will be allocated

to the States on the basis of the present distribution formula, to insure that the States do not lose water treatment money. However, the additional 20 percent, or \$200 million of the direct appropriation, will be allocated on the basis of eligibility of certain States for reimbursement for prefunding. This would mean a valuable assist in the problem of outstanding reimbursables. Additionally, grant moneys unobligated will be re-allocated by the end of the fiscal year, rather than after 18 months, which is the prevailing formula. Such revision would insure more expeditious allocation.

Another portion of today's appropriations bill to which I call the attention of my colleagues is the portion of the measure dealing with hydroelectric generating plants. We all know about the great need for increased electrical power, and the potential power failures and so-called brownouts we may experience this summer. As the per capita usage of electricity increases at a tremendous rate, we are hard pressed to keep up with the demand. Today's measure contains a total of about \$329 million to continue planning and construction of 37 multipurpose power facilities by the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and the Bonneville Power Administration in 30 States. Additional generator capacity, free of air and thermal pollution, would be provided annually at an estimated amount of 42.8 billion kilowatts of electricity.

Although I support this bill, I agree with the Appropriations Committee that attention must be paid in the matter of fund allocations under the Clean Water Restoration Act. States that promptly invest in water treatment plants under this legislation should be reimbursed within a reasonable span of time, rather than being placed into a financial bind for having constructed needed facilities.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, MIKE KIRWAN will be proud of this day's RECORD. The good work of the subcommittee of which he has been chairman for so many years will be a cause of special satisfaction. It has brought to the House a clear expression of the desires of the committee for a sound and comprehensive bill to aid in the continued development of America's waterway resources. This is befitting of MIKE KIRWAN's own subcommittee. He loves this America of ours and he has contributed as much as any man in Congress to the protection and development of our natural resources and our waterways.

MIKE will be equally happy at the statements which are being made here today by Members who have served with him and who appreciate all of his great sterling qualities. He has been a truly outstanding leader in the Congress and his work will always stand high in the listing of those important activities which contribute to a better and stronger America on tomorrow.

Everyone who has served with MIKE KIRWAN can be proud of the privilege, for it is indeed a privilege to serve with a man of his caliber. I have been proud to share his friendship in the years we

have served together and happy to respect and follow his leadership.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DRUGGELL) to provide full funding for fiscal year 1971 for the waste treatment programs authorized by the Clean Water Restoration Act. My colleague has been an able advocate of achieving the full potential of this legislation, and I am glad to join in this effort.

This amendment to H.R. 18127—the Public Works for water, pollution control, and power development, and Atomic Energy Commission appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971—would provide an additional \$250 million.

I think few, if any, Members lack understanding of the water pollution crisis which afflicts the Nation. But let me briefly detail some of the facts, which, in their stark simplicity, must surely allay any lingering doubts that the most massive effort—Federal, State, and local—calling for enormous amounts of money, is imperative immediately.

Every second of every day, about 2 million gallons of sewage and other fluid waste pour into the Nation's waterways. Twenty-five trillion gallons of waste water are spilled annually into American rivers and lakes by industry alone. Lake Erie is the recipient of 9.6 billion gallons of this daily.

Among the wastes being dumped into our waters every day are some or all of the following:

Sewage and other wastes from cities and industries, from pleasure boats, commercial ships, and marinas.

Nutrients—principally phosphates and nitrates—from sewage, industrial wastes, and land runoff.

Salts from our winter streets, from field irrigation, and from industrial processes.

Heavy metals from industrial plants. Acids from underground and surface mines and industrial processes.

Disease-causing bacteria, mainly from municipal sewage.

Complex chemicals from household detergents, pesticides, herbicides, and wastes from industrial processes.

Silts, sands, and debris.

Oils from ships, on land and offshore drill rigs, and shoreline industrial facilities.

In the face of this monstrous devastation of our waters, we are at the same time approaching the maximum utilization of our water supplies, and thus will be forced to reuse and reuse the waters that are available. The daily available water supply flowing in our rivers has been estimated at between 1,100 and 1,300 billion gallons per day. Between 560 and 700 billion gallons is the optimum amount that the experts believe can be captured through water development and engineering projects. Currently, we use about 355 billion gallons daily. By 1980, this daily utilization will rise to between 570 and 600 billion gallons daily. And by the year 2000, daily use will reach 900 to 1,000 billion gallons.

Without question, our waters must be cleaned. There is, in no uncertain terms,

no time left. And yet, money is the essential key. Effective waste treatment plants must be built. And these are very expensive facilities, the need for which far outstrips the available moneys.

Between fiscal year 1965 and fiscal year 1967, a total of \$400 million was authorized for the sewage treatment plant program, and a sum of \$407 million was made available. There was no gap in those years between authorization and appropriation, but when one looks at recent history, the gap is tremendous. For fiscal year 1968, \$450 million was authorized and \$203 million appropriated, or a difference of \$247 million not appropriated. In fiscal year 1969, when \$700 million was authorized for the program, only \$214 million was appropriated, a gap of \$400 million.

Last fiscal year, the appropriation of \$800 million fell \$200 million below the \$1 billion authorization. Following is a list of the allocations per State of this \$800 million funding:

State:	Millions of dollars
Alabama	14.7
Alaska	1.6
Arizona	6.3
Arkansas	8.6
California	65.6
Colorado	8.1
Connecticut	11.1
Delaware	2.5
District of Columbia	3.8
Florida	21.4
Georgia	17.3
Hawaii	3.4
Idaho	3.7
Illinois	42.3
Indiana	20.0
Iowa	12.2
Kansas	9.8
Kentucky	13.6
Louisiana	14.5
Maine	5.0
Maryland	13.6
Massachusetts	22.0
Michigan	33.0
Minnesota	14.9
Mississippi	10.4
Missouri	18.7
Montana	3.7
Nebraska	6.7
Nevada	1.9
New Hampshire	3.4
New Jersey	25.7
New Mexico	5.0
New York	69.9
North Carolina	19.9
North Dakota	3.6
Ohio	40.9
Oklahoma	10.6
Oregon	8.1
Pennsylvania	47.5
Rhode Island	4.3
South Carolina	11.0
South Dakota	3.8
Tennessee	15.8
Texas	40.5
Utah	4.7
Vermont	2.5
Virginia	17.3
Washington	12.5
West Virginia	8.8
Wisconsin	17.1
Wyoming	2.2
Guam	1.7
Puerto Rico	11.1
Virgin Islands	1.5

This year the Appropriations Committee has reported out a bill—H.R. 18127—which provides funding in the amount of \$1 billion. I am happy to see that there

is an increase over the last fiscal year. However, this increase—amounting to \$200 million—is still insufficient, as shown by the following figures prepared by the National League of Cities-U.S. Conference of Mayors, which are based on Federal aid needs figures from FWPCA reported as of August 31, 1969, supplemented by data from an October 1969 survey, by the Interstate Conference on Water Pollution and the Council of State Governments:

States (by population)	1968 population	Fall 1969 needs for FWPCA assistance
California	19,221,000	\$100,000,000
New York	18,113,000	1,290,681,200
Pennsylvania	11,712,000	76,300,000
Illinois	10,974,000	128,862,798
Texas	10,972,000	20,327,857
Ohio	10,591,000	44,867,124
Michigan	8,704,000	183,113,623
New Jersey	7,078,000	48,201,480
Florida	6,160,000	37,728,978
Massachusetts	5,437,000	32,000,000
North Carolina	5,135,000	5,653,460
Indiana	5,067,000	34,862,181
Missouri	4,627,000	50,200,000
Virginia	4,597,000	20,195,417
Georgia	4,588,000	35,000,000
Wisconsin	4,213,000	94,324,180
Tennessee	3,976,000	23,818,086
Maryland	3,757,000	48,800,960
Louisiana	3,732,000	7,604,570
Minnesota	3,646,000	18,900,000
Alabama	3,566,000	479,700
Washington	3,276,000	17,086,410
Kentucky	3,229,000	3,082,386
Connecticut	2,959,000	29,591,250
Iowa	2,748,000	6,326,224
South Carolina	2,692,000	12,000,000
Oklahoma	2,518,000	1,882,702
Mississippi	2,342,000	1,764,310
Kansas	2,303,000	3,892,883
Colorado	2,048,000	1,453,652
Arkansas	2,012,000	8,000,000
Oregon	2,008,000	16,017,220
West Virginia	1,805,000	5,141,200
Arizona	1,670,000	1,829,080
Nebraska	1,437,000	3,521,850
Utah	1,024,000	1,238,540
New Mexico	1,015,000	1,422,423
Maine	979,000	19,737,725
Rhode Island	913,000	7,000,000
Hawaii	778,000	4,000,000
Idaho	705,000	128,000
New Hampshire	702,000	11,222,400
Montana	693,000	3,305,000
South Dakota	657,000	2,485,581
North Dakota	625,000	134,222
Delaware	534,000	710,350
Nevada	453,000	4,950,068
Vermont	422,000	2,377,870
Wyoming	315,000	275,732
Alaska	277,000	3,000,000

I think these figures very clearly demonstrate the wisdom of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), and the necessity of its passage.

Of course, even the additional \$250 million it provides nowhere meets the real needs that exist. For example, it is costing, in New York City alone, \$1.2 billion to build sewage treatment plants. The program for the State will cost \$3 billion. Yet, under the proposed \$1 billion appropriation, New York State will only receive approximately \$166 million. And taking New York State's needs as comprising 10 percent of the national needs, the amount that is needed amounts to \$30 billion nationally. But it at least brings the appropriation up to the full funding authorization level.

I should like to note, also, that the committee has taken a commendable step in proposing that \$200 million of the \$1 billion appropriation provided by H.R. 18127 be allocated on the basis of the eligibility of certain States for reimbursement toward the Federal share of such

projects as they have prefunded. Outstanding reimbursables amount to some \$894 million. New York State alone is due \$382,618,917. The committee proposal will partially alleviate this problem.

In addition, I would commend the committee for adding language providing that grant moneys not obligated out of the amounts allocated to the State under the present formula by the end of the fiscal year—rather than 18 months—shall then be reallocated, thus speeding up the process of distributing grant moneys.

Of course, what is particularly essential is legislation which would amend the current reallocation policy so that only those States which are currently receiving 50 percent grants will be eligible for the reallocation of unused funds. I have introduced H.R. 12956 to achieve this. It provides that such States will divide the reallocation funds in the ratio that their current year's allotment bears to the total of all the allotment for 50-percent States. Thereby, allotment is based on need, not artificial figures.

Again, I urge the full funding of the waste treatment facilities program. The need is great. The public wants action, as shown by the April 20 Louis Harris poll, which reported that 54 percent of the American people would be willing to pay \$15 a year more in taxes to finance Federal pollution control programs. Moreover, all nine proposals in nine States offered since 1963 for State bond issues funding water treatment plants have been passed, by a percentage of 65.9 in favor. Necessity and the public's commitment coincide.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, in 1965 the Congress and the Nation took a great step forward when we enacted the Water Quality Act of 1965, which authorized the establishment of water quality standards on all the country's interstate rivers, lakes, and coastal waters. This act represented the first effort in the history of our Nation to attach the problem of water pollution on an entire river basis. It recognized the State's primary role in this field by requiring the States to establish adequate water quality criteria applicable to interstate waters.

In 1966, in what has been referred to by many as "one of the 89th Congress' most sweeping accomplishments," we enacted the Clean Water Restoration Act wherein we recognized that in order to make progress in the battle against water pollution a partnership arrangement between the Federal, State, and local governments was needed. We recognized that only with all levels of governmental participation could this program be a success. In order to effectuate this partnership, the Congress authorized as the Federal share of the agreement \$3.4 billion for construction grants for sewage treatment plants for fiscal years 1968 through 1971. The amounts authorized for each year were \$450 million for 1968, \$700 million for 1969, \$1 billion for 1970, and \$1.25 billion for 1971.

The Clean Water Restoration Act made every effort to make the State a partner in the program. If a State agreed to match 30 percent of the total cost of an individual or combined proj-

ect, the Federal share is increased from the basic 30 to 40 percent and the municipal share, in turn, becomes 30 percent. In addition, if water quality standards have been established in accordance with existing law for interstate waters, the share is increased from 40 to 50 percent then the State's share is reduced to 25 percent in order to permit sharing the remaining 50 percent non-Federal costs equally on a State and local basis. This was, without question, a great move forward to bring about a working combination so that all levels of government throughout this great country could participate in this major effort to clean up our waters.

So much for history—now what does the record show for accomplishments? It shows that since we decided to do battle, we on the Federal side have reneged on our arrangements with our partners. We promised \$450 million for fiscal year 1968—we in fact appropriated \$203 million—45 percent of what we promised. For fiscal year 1969 we said the Federal Government would put up \$700 million—instead we appropriated \$214 million—30 percent of what we promised. For fiscal year 1970 we authorized \$1 billion. The administration's budget request was a meager \$214 billion—21.4 percent of the promised amount. The Congress, to its credit, raised this wholly insufficient amount of \$214 million to \$800 million—a vast improvement—but still not the full authorization. Thus, instead of the \$2.15 billion authorized for fiscal years 1968 through 1970, there were in fact appropriations of only \$1.217 billion.

It is interesting to note that presently there are applications for construction grants pending at the Federal Water Quality Administration of over \$1.512 billion. This indicates that the levels of appropriations recommended by the Committee on Public Works in the Clean Water Restoration Act were accurate. Had we adhered to the schedule recommended in the authorization legislation, we would be just about current in meeting our needs instead of falling behind as we have over this period of time.

I want to compliment my colleagues who serve on the Appropriations Committee for recommending the \$1 billion included in H.R. 18127 for construction grants. Although this figure is less than the amount authorized, the committee did an excellent job, all things considered.

The committee was hampered by the administration's failure to recommend one single dollar in direct appropriations, and the administration's insistence on a confused and cumbersome proposal involving deferred payments to the State and municipal participants sometime in the distant future.

There has been considerable criticism directed at the Federal Water Quality Administration in its handling of the construction grant program, particularly over the fact that there will be a \$440 million carryover from last year's appropriation—an amount which should have been put into the program.

However, at least some of the blame for this must rest with the administra-

tion for its indecision from December 1969 to February 1970, as to whether it would spend the moneys actually appropriated by the Congress.

Moreover, it should be recognized that had the appropriations matched the authorization levels in the earlier years of the program, the Federal Water Quality Administration and the States would now be geared to handling a grant program of this magnitude. However, in fact, last year was the first year that there were sufficient funds available to operate at the appropriate level. As in the highway program where the States are assured of Federal funding 2 years in advance, so do the States and municipalities in the water pollution control program need assurance that funds will be available when required. Thus, only when the program is operating at full steam can we fully judge where improvement ought to be made.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Public Works will reexamine the entire program to find where the problems are and to break through the bottlenecks which have slowed down the process of getting the money to the States where it is needed. As of this coming Friday, the staff of the committee will meet with representatives of the Federal Water Quality Administration to review its entire program.

Again, let me commend the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) and all the members of this fine committee for their cooperativeness and efforts in reporting this bill.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill which will improve our environment and conserve the natural resources of this great country. This bill dramatically illustrates the commitment of the Congress to provide for the continuing development and proper usage of our water, energy, and soil.

Our growing population makes it imperative that we take necessary steps to protect our ecology. One of the gravest pollution problems in my district exists at Eagle Lake. This lake was created when the Mississippi River changed course over a hundred years ago, and since then has been replenished with fresh water during the flood stages of the Mississippi until 2 years ago. Previously, water entered Eagle Lake from the Mississippi via the Yazoo River, Steele Bayou, and Muddy Bayou. Now, however, the lake receives flood water from the Sunflower and Steele Bayou sump areas originating in the upper Mississippi Delta. As a result, silt, herbicides, and pesticides now flow into the lake, a 3,800-acre lake with residential, commercial, and recreational development.

The \$100,000 in the bill to plan and begin construction of a water control structure in Muddy Bayou is urgently needed to preserve this national and natural resource.

I am pleased that the bill contains \$40,000 for planning for the expansion of the Vicksburg Harbor. This is a worthy undertaking which is economically sound.

Mr. Chairman, I am vitally interested in the proposed 9-foot channel from the mouth of the Yazoo River at Vicksburg to Greenwood, Miss. This channel would reduce transportation costs in a 14-county area to the benefit of agricultural, commercial, and manufacturing interests.

This project was authorized only 2 years ago and the estimated cost is \$57,300,000. I understand the position of the Committee on Appropriations in deferring sound projects as this in view of national security requirements and the overall budget problem. It is my earnest hope that we will soon be able to reduce our commitments in Southeast Asia and begin funding projects, such as the Yazoo channel, which I consider important to the continued economic development of America.

Again, I commend Members of the Committee on Appropriations for bringing to the House a bill of immense importance to all Americans.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the 51-member Committee on Appropriations has approved this measure, the spadework for which was done by the fine subcommittee headed by our distinguished and beloved colleague, MIKE KIRWAN, the gentleman from Ohio.

The gentleman from Ohio has been a tower of strength in Congress for many years. His record of accomplishment in the area of conservation and public works is unsurpassed in the history of Congress. I take this moment to congratulate him and wish him well.

As to the measure before us, I urge Members to support the work of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the very genial and eloquent member of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD).

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, that was very gracious of my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee. My purpose is to congratulate the Members who have said the kind words about our beloved colleague, MIKE KIRWAN, but none of the Members know MIKE KIRWAN as well as and as intimately as I. MIKE was born and raised in my district, about 2 miles from my home. How long ago MIKE would say is nobody's business. He told stories about himself and we have told great stories about him. But, if ever there was to be engraved upon marble an image of what we call the typical American, that rugged individual, that grand American, it would be MIKE KIRWAN, first of Pennsylvania and then of Ohio.

I will extend my remarks on MIKE KIRWAN, but I must tell the Members this one story. MIKE lived at the University Club here in Washington. One is only supposed to live there if he has graduated from a university, but like everything else, everybody made an exception for MIKE. The custom is that once every year the new residents will stand up at

the dinner and introduce themselves and say where they came from, such as, "I am John Smith, Harvard, 1929," and then he sits down. The next fellow stands up, "I am John Jones, Yale, 1929," and he sits down, and so on.

Finally they came to MIKE, and he stood up, and with that absolutely deadpan the Members know he has, he said, "MICHAEL KIRWAN, Heidelberg, 1903."

Everybody was astounded. The great University of Heidelberg.

Heidelberg was the colliery he worked at as a breaker boy in my district in 1903.

So down through the years, since I first came here in 1945 and he took me by the hand and led me through this labyrinth which is this body, it has been a pleasure to come and salute this distinguished graduate of Heidelberg.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY), after which I hope we can proceed with the reading of the bill.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time, which is not far off, I shall offer an amendment to restore to the bill the \$807,000 for further preconstruction planning for the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric project in northern Maine.

This amount of \$807,000 was contained in the administration budget but was knocked out by the full committee.

Before I get into talking about the merits of this project, let me join with the others in offering my commendations for the great work Chairman MIKE KIRWAN has done for the committee and for the Congress.

I also want to commend the subcommittee for the excellent job it did in this regard, particularly since the subcommittee did endorse the Dickey-Lincoln School project.

I appreciate the very kind remarks of the gentleman from Arizona, the gentleman from Wisconsin, and the gentleman from Massachusetts with respect to this project, and of the many others who have made some kind and generous remarks not only this year but also in years past.

The history of this project, as many Members undoubtedly know, is that it was authorized by the Congress in 1965, the 89th Congress. In that year it received its first appropriation of \$800,000. Since then it has received a total of \$2.1 million for preconstruction planning. It will take a total of about \$3.5 million to finish the preconstruction planning stage of the project. The total cost of the project is about \$267 million.

The project, as indicated by the gentleman from Wisconsin, has a very favorable benefit-to-cost ratio, about 1.9 to 1, which is better than the vast majority of the projects Members will be considering today.

The project has had bipartisan support, not only in the State of Maine, with a Republican Governor endorsing it in 1965 and 1966, and a Democratic Governor endorsing it thereafter, but also it has been endorsed by the Johnson administration and now endorsed by the

Nixon administration. So it is not a partisan matter.

The Dickey-Lincoln School project, which is located on the St. John River on the Canadian border, in the most northern part of Maine, and in my district, will of course supply a considerable amount of power to the New England area, which is at the present time experiencing, like many other parts of the country, a severe shortage with respect to power.

In addition to supplying power, it will also serve as a yardstick by which the people of New England can judge whether or not the privately owned utilities are supplying power at a rate that is reasonable. This yardstick has been used in other parts of the country through TVA and through Bonneville and many other federally financed power projects, and has brought down the cost of power in all other parts of the country except the Northeast.

There are other benefits besides the power benefits of the Dickey-Lincoln School project. There are also recreational benefits. There are also flood control benefits. More recently—and all this has not been studied out thoroughly—there is a real possibility of substantial irrigation benefits.

As many Members may know, Maine is the second largest producing State of potatoes in this country, and up until recently we had considered in Maine that the annual rainfall was enough for the potato crop.

Recent studies have indicated that the Maine crop does not get the 1 inch a week of rainfall that is necessary in order to produce good potatoes. It has been estimated by the Department of Agriculture that if we had irrigation possibilities in northern Maine for the potato crop, this would mean an additional \$20 million a year in benefits to that area. The total annual benefits from the project right now are \$24 million, so this would just about double the benefits we would get from this project.

Mr. Chairman, let me point out two significant aspects of this project, which, although pointed out previously, have not been highlighted as much in the past as they have been this year. This year I think the American public is much more pollution conscious than it has ever been before in our history. The Dickey-Lincoln School Project, like any other hydroelectric project, is the only—the only—nonpolluting source of energy we have left. We should not only continue spending for the Dickey-Lincoln School project, but we ought to be exploiting our water resources throughout the country in developing every hydroelectric project that is possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HATHAWAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the additional time.

The other aspect that has come to our attention is the real severe power shortage that we are experiencing especially

in the East. Just recently a local power company—I believe it was the Potomac Electric Power Co.—sent out notices along with its bills asking its customers to cut down their consumption of electricity because they would not have enough to go around this summer, particularly in regard to air conditioning. Reading from the Consolidated Edison Co. 1969 power-supply problems and 10-year expansion plans, just last year at 6 o'clock in the morning of July 18, 1969, this company initiated telephone calls to large users requesting voluntary curtailment of nonessential uses of electricity. On June 2 of 1970, just a few days ago, the six-State New England area experienced a 5-percent voltage reduction in the midst of—and this is very ironic—in the midst of the Edison Electric Institute's 38th annual convention in Boston. This occurred as temperatures soared into the upper 80's unexpectedly and seven major turbine generators were temporarily out of service. While no service was actually interrupted, this incident still illustrates all too clearly how easily an unexpected brownout of greater severity could occur.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I hope you will support my amendment when it is offered.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS), a very eloquent member of the committee.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I am the newest member of this subcommittee. I attended the hearings as often as I could in spite of other committee work that I had. I thoroughly enjoyed working with the committee. It is a good, hard-working committee, blessed with one of the ablest staffs I have ever served with.

I just want to concur in all of the fine things that have been said about MIKE KIRWIN. This was really MIKE's bill. He loved America and he loved this bill, because this is the bill that makes America the beautiful.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER).

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the public works appropriations bill for fiscal year 1971. The funds provided in this bill will substantially improve the development and conservation of our Nation's water resources and will support the enhancement of navigation facilities throughout the country.

Included in this bill is an appropriation of \$125,000 to complete advanced engineering and design studies on the Fall River Harbor project and \$325,000 to begin the actual construction of this vitally needed project.

The construction start for the Fall River project was not included in the budget for fiscal year 1971. For its inclusion in this bill the people of the Fall River area are very grateful for the support of the Subcommittee on Public Works and the full Committee on Appropriations.

In addition, I want to commend my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) for his assistance in obtaining this important appropriation.

Fall River Harbor is the second largest harbor in Massachusetts. It is an important commercial asset to Fall River proper and to all of southeastern Massachusetts. Annual traffic in the harbor continues to grow and is at about 4 million tons annually. Specifications of the existing project were adopted by the Congress in 1954 and have proven to be inadequate in permitting achievement of the full potential of the harbor.

Even though the city of Fall River is in a difficult financial position, it is undertaking several expensive projects such as this one in order to insure economic growth and a strong economic base.

The city recently committed itself to \$900,000 as its share for constructing a bulkhead to retain the dredged materials and the State legislature will shortly match that amount—\$900,000 is a great burden on the city but it has accepted the burden willingly as it is aware of the benefits which can accrue from the project.

This project is quite unique in the variety of benefits it provides. For example, about 1 million cubic yards of dredged material from the project will be used to create about 40 acres of land for tourist and industrial purposes. This will result in a \$1 million saving in project costs.

The project will allow the waterfront to be transformed from its present deteriorated condition to a productive asset to the community. Thus, the benefits go far beyond the scope of the project. The official cost-benefit ratio is an impressive 3.5 to 1 and yet it reflects only a portion of the benefits which will accrue from construction of this valuable project.

Mr. Chairman, I urge our colleagues to support the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations to provide \$450,000 for construction of the Fall River Harbor project. In doing so we will be taking a most significant step forward in the development of a strong, stable economy in southeastern Massachusetts.

Also, included in the bill is an appropriation for \$20,000 for the general study of the Westport River. This is a navigation study and I fully support the appropriation.

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

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts upon her statement. As she has indicated, this project does carry in this bill an item of \$450,000 with which to complete planning and start construction on the Fall River Harbor.

Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished gentleman so well stated, this is one of the more important commercial harbors in New England. It is vitally necessary for the economic health of Fall River.

As the gentlewoman knows, \$50,000 was held in reserve from the 1970 bill—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield further, the Bureau of the Budget for fiscal year 1971 budgeted \$75,000 additional. Because of the interest of the gentlewoman from Fall River not alone at the hearings before our subcommittee in indicating her intense and deep interest in this project, but the full committee, and also because of her intercession with the Bureau of the Budget and the Corps of Engineers in her persuasive style, the administration has indicated that it has an additional capability of \$325,000 to start construction.

Of course, as my colleague has indicated the starting of construction is a very important element for this particular project.

And so because of her deep interest, and the fact that she did seek out members of the subcommittee and explain the circumstances of the project to those members, and the members of the full committee, the gentlewoman is entitled to credit for getting construction started in this fiscal year 1971. I want to compliment the gentlewoman on her activity in this area.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. REIFEL).

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I heartily join my colleagues in their warm words of praise and appreciation for the distinguished service and able leadership of my great friend MIKE KIRWAN, chairman of this Public Works Subcommittee on Appropriations. The bill is a good bill but had MIKE been able to actively chair the hearings it would have been an even finer product. America is a far better land because MIKE looked out for it when he was chairman of the Subcommittee of Interior and Related Agencies on which I presently have the honor to serve and as he lead this great subcommittee. MIKE was at the same time a great friend of the Indians of this country. He recognized their inadequate assistance years ago and did everything in his power to do something about it. He is responsible for increasing appropriations for their health, welfare, education, and conservation of their lands. In their behalf I take pleasure in expressing deepest gratitude. I want also to thank the subcommittee for its favorable consideration of the projects in the bill for my State.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have one more request for time, and I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD).

FIELD), the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the acting chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) for yielding me this time. I will make it very short.

This is an important bill, and I am heartily in support of the bill.

About roughly two-fifths of the bill supports the total atomic energy program, and about half of that, or a little over half of the two-fifths, or a little over one-fifth, has to do with the national security in the weapons area, and in the high energy physics and middle energy physics which is a national program, not strictly tied to atomic energy. It is a very important scientific series of projects, which has the support of the whole scientific community of the United States and, in fact, the world, because we are doing things that interest the scientists all over the world.

I want particularly to express my thanks to the members of the subcommittee and to their very efficient staff for the handling of this section of the bill. Also I want to call the attention of the Members at this time that one of the important parts of this bill is funds for the development of electric generating reactors, not only the existing type of light water reactors which are now functioning. These reactors are on the line and in production throughout the Nation. There are something like 65 of the plants being built throughout the Nation, and many are being built in foreign countries. Those that we build and transfer to foreign countries constitute a very favorable item in our dollar exchange settlements.

Now, it is not commonly known, I think, among the people of this country, that we are going to face a tremendous power shortage. I think we are going to face power shortages this year because of the deficit that we have in electricity for our factories and our homes. We are using something like 300,000 megawatts of power in this country. According to the 1970 electrical energy power survey, they state that our power generating capacity has to quadruple in 20 years. We may make that statement rather glibly, but it is a true statement because we have to double our production in 10 years, and then we have to go ahead in the next 10 years and increase it enough to make it quadruple the existing power facilities.

So we are going to need all the energy we can get in this country. We are going to have brownouts this summer. The local power companies have already sent notices to their people to turn off their air conditioning. And we may even have blackouts like we had just a few years ago in the Northeast.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I have time remaining, and I will be glad to yield the gentleman from California 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. Chairman, I will conclude by saying this, that the whole structure of our society is based upon the utilization of electrical energy. We are going to have to have all of the electricity that we can generate from nuclear sources, from coal, oil, and gas.

I am not here to argue today for nuclear energy to replace other forms of energy. We are going to have to use them all. We are going to have to clean up those elements of pollution that are produced in any of these basic forms of fuel used in generating electricity.

One of the important factors in this bill today is the recognition of that fact and the inclusion of funds to proceed in an orderly way to continue to develop nuclear reactors and to produce the nuclear fuels that go into these reactors.

Nuclear reactors will be built by non-Federal funds from the private sectors.

They will be produced without cost to the U.S. Treasury. The nuclear fuel will be sold on a cost recoverable basis and every gram of this fuel, this nuclear fuel, is going to be paid for. In fact, there is going to be a price contingency in the sale price of nuclear fuel that will net money into the U.S. Treasury.

So we are investing not only in the present but in the future of America for every dollar that is in this bill. I thank the committee very much for their support.

#### CASCADE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

I am most gratified that H.R. 18127 contains \$21.1 million for the construction projects which represent the start of the Cascade improvement program. This program, when completed, will substantially increase the capacity of the AEC's three gaseous diffusion plants located at Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Paducah, Ky.; and Portsmouth, Ohio. These plants provide uranium enrichment services—an essential step in the production of fuel for the nuclear powerplants of this country and more than 30 other free world nations.

The cascade improvement program must be started in the coming year so that we can continue to meet the rapidly growing need for the low-cost electricity in our own country and in the many other nations that depend on us for their nuclear fuel.

The Joint Committee explored this matter thoroughly during its hearings on the AEC's fiscal year 1971 authorization bill. We learned that the AEC had submitted to the Bureau of the Budget a request for authorization of \$170 million and appropriations of \$60 million in fiscal year 1971 for the program. However, the administration approved only \$5 million for architect-engineering work with no commitment to capital expenditures for plant improvement.

The Joint Committee concluded that the funds requested and the very limited activity contemplated by the administration would have been grossly inadequate. Therefore, the committee recommended an additional \$16.1 million to provide a meaningful start of the cascade improvement program.

This matter was reviewed once more only last week during Joint Committee hearings on the Nixon administration's ill-timed and poorly conceived proposal to increase the price of enrichment services and establish new ground rules for pricing. During those hearings, the committee released the latest data available from the AEC on uranium enrichment requirements versus the capacity of the existing gaseous diffusion plants. These data showed that the announced nuclear power reactors, both domestic and foreign, will require uranium enrichment services greater than existing U.S. gaseous diffusion plant capacity after allowance for anticipated U.S. Government requirements.

The existing diffusion plants will be able to supply about 130,000 megawatts of nuclear electric powerplants based on today's reactor technology. The total announced nuclear powerplants will have a capacity of about 160,000 megawatts—30,000 megawatts more than can be supplied by our existing diffusion plants. And, of course, these figures do not take into account the many additional nuclear powerplants which we know will be needed to meet our future energy needs.

What this means is that right now—today—we know that we will be unable to provide the nuclear fuel for all of these powerplants when they go into operation unless something is done to either increase the capacity of the diffusion plants or reduce the amount of enrichment services needed to supply fuel for these powerplants. Improvements in reactor technology and the use of plutonium as nuclear fuel, if achieved, could result in some reduction in enrichment requirements. However, that reduction will fall far short of obviating the need to provide additional enrichment capacity.

I believe the only way we can assure that sufficient fuel will continue to be available is through installation of the cascade improvement program. Unless this program is started, we will soon have to stop making additional commitments to supply fuel for other nations' nuclear power reactors—a step which could lead to the rapid development of foreign enrichment plants with an attendant loss of U.S. trade benefits and increased risk of weapons proliferation. This cannot be allowed to happen. We must start the cascade improvement program without further delay. The funds included in the bill before us provide a meaningful start on this work.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Sixty-eight Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 186]

Abbutt	Baring	Brasco
Adair	Barrett	Brock
Albert	Blaggi	Caffery
Anderson,	Blackburn	Carey
Tenn.	Bow	Celler

Chisholm	Fuqua	Pollock
Clancy	Gaydos	Powell
Clay	Gilbert	Purcell
Corbett	Gray	Robison
Cramer	Hamilton	Rooney, N.Y.
Daddario	Hanna	Smith, Iowa
Daniels, N.J.	Hansen, Idaho	Stratton
Dawson	Hawkins	Stuckey
de la Garza	Keith	Thompson, Ga.
Dent	Kirwan	Thompson, N.J.
Dickinson	McCarthy	Watson
Diggs	McEwen	Weicker
Dulski	McMillan	Wilson,
Erlenborn	Meskill	Charles H.
Esch	Mollohan	Wold
Farbstein	Olsen	Wright
Fish	O'Neal, Ga.	Young
Frey	Ottinger	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. ASPINALL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 18127, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 361 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:

#### CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by law; and detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction): \$825,689,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by law or which are authorized by law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated: *Provided further*, That in connection with the rehabilitation of the Snake Creek Embankment of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir Project, North Dakota, the Corps of Engineers is authorized to participate with the State of North Dakota to the extent of one-half the cost of widening the present embankment to provide a four-lane right-of-way for U.S. Highway 83 in lieu of the present two-lane highway: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated for the Robert S. Kerr Lock and Dam, Oklahoma, shall be available to provide a 9-foot deep auxiliary navigation channel and 1,000-foot long turning basin along Sans Bois Creek, with appropriate widths and an overall length of approximately ten miles: *Provided further*, That the Elks Creek Reservoir Project in Oregon shall not be operated for irrigation purposes until such time as the Secretary of the Interior makes the necessary arrangements with non-Federal interests to recover the costs, in accordance with Federal Reclamation Law, which are allocated to the irrigation purpose: *Provided further*, That \$625,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563-565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Department of the Army.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HATHAWAY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HATHAWAY: Page 6, line 19, strike out "\$825,689,000," and insert in lieu thereof "\$826,496,000,".

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, the purpose of this amendment is to restore to the bill the \$807,000 which this administration has recommended in its budget for further funding of the preconstruction planning stage of the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric project located on the St. John River in northern Maine.

During the general debate I gave the background for this project, indicating that it was authorized by the Congress in 1965 and received its first appropriation by the 89th Congress, and since then has received a total of \$2,100,000.

In recent years appropriations have not been forthcoming, for reasons that it is hard for me to believe, especially in this day and age of acute power shortages that we are now experiencing, especially in the East.

Just recently, many of you who live in this area received with your electric light bill a notice from Pepco indicating that they would like their consumers to cut back on the consumption of electricity this summer because they do not have enough electricity to supply this area.

The same thing is true in New England that is true in this area. Unless we get busy and construct not only the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric project—but tap every source of hydroelectric power that we can possibly tap in addition to the other fossil fuel projects, we are going to be suffering from continuous brownouts and blackouts.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that we are experiencing a very acute power shortage, which the Dickey-Lincoln School Dam will not of course solve of itself, but will help considerably—the Dickey-Lincoln School project like any other hydroelectric project is the only—the only—nonpolluting source of electricity that we have.

Now what are some of the objections that I know are going to be raised to putting in the \$807,000 for further preconstruction planning. Well, one of them is that the investor-owned utilities have what they call in New England the big 11 power loop which is supposed to supply some of the additional requirements that are going to be needed in the next 10 years.

Now I commend the investor-owned utilities for coming out with the big 11 power loop, most of which will be on the line by 1975.

But as a recent report, one that has not been published as yet, called the Zender Report, for which the New England Governors and the New England Regional Commission spent \$170,000, states, the big 11 power loop will not be enough to cover all of the electric demands in the New England area from now until 1990.

In addition, I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, that the big 11 power loop was never conceived until the Dickey-Lincoln project was passed by the House Public Works Committee in 1965. Prior to that

the Electric Coordinating Council of New England which had been in existence since 1948 had not made any plans whatsoever to meet the excessive demands for electricity in that area. It was only when the Dickey-Lincoln project was becoming a reality that they came up with this big 11 power loop.

This is just one of the purposes that a public power facility serves in any area. We have seen this happen in areas throughout the country. It gets the investor-owned utilities on the ball so that they come up with additional generating plants and they charge a lower cost for their electricity.

I mentioned in the course of my remarks the Zender Report. Zender Associates is a consulting firm in the District of Columbia. Seventy percent of their time is spent doing investigative work for privately owned utilities. They are a completely unbiased agency, and they say in the course of their report:

The Dickey-Lincoln School Project would fit admirably into a bulk power system operated by an Interstate Compact Agency. The requirement of federal law that preference be given to public bodies would be met by the sale of the output of this plant to such an agency. It would also be an attractive project for a federal regional agency with bulk power supply responsibility. If neither of these alternatives is adopted, arrangements should be made whereby the public agencies would so exercise their preference rights that Dickey-Lincoln School power would be made available to NEPOOL as part of the contribution of the public sector to the pool power supply.

The capital cost of the Dickey-Lincoln School Project was estimated by the Corps of Engineers in January, 1970 to be \$248 million. This compares with the 1964 estimate of \$217.7 million giving an increase of only 14 percent in five years—and the Corps estimate is considered reasonable.

The Subcommittee on Public Works of the Appropriations Committee has listened to the Corps of Engineers figures for the past 5 years, and for the past 5 years the Subcommittee has believed the figures of the Corps of Engineers. It is the same Corps of Engineers that has evaluated many other projects in this same bill you are going to be voting upon.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Dickey-Lincoln School project has been before this House for an appropriation for engineering study money each year for 6 years. The House in its wisdom has turned down the appropriation each year for the last 5 years. This project, if constructed—and I come from this area—would flood thousands of acres of some of the most beautiful wilderness area in the country, and it would spoil a good many miles of one of the most beautiful free-flowing rivers in the Nation.

There is no justification for ruining the area with a hydro project that is nearly 100 percent for electric power generation, when the cost of that power would be more expensive than from alternate power sources.

In addition to that fact, the flooded area would have a flowage in a recreational season of 20 vertical feet, so that it would be of little real use for recreation or other purposes, as well as all the

other problems created for the area by the process of flooding 88,000 acres of beautiful forest land.

The 1965 report of the Interior Department to President Johnson stated on page 5 that the cost of the peaking power from the project, which is its principal objective, would be \$15.50 per kilowatt a year for capacity and 3 mills for energy, which compares to the price of power from an alternate source; namely, the Northfield Mountain pump storage project, in Northfield, Mass., of \$12.08 per kilowatt and 2.9 mills reported by the Federal Power Commission on May 14, 1968, in an FPC opinion No. 1541, volume 39, FPC 723.

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

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. Is it not true that most of the Dickey-Lincoln power will be used for peaking power in the area?

Mr. WYMAN. That is correct.

Mr. GIAIMO. Is it not true there is being constructed at the Northfield Mountain project, which is a pump storing operation, a peaking power source which will provide more than the Dickey-Lincoln; namely 1 million kilowatts at a cost in excess of \$80 million, as opposed to the tremendous cost of the Dickey-Lincoln?

Mr. WYMAN. That is correct. About 75 percent of the project Dickey-Lincoln power capacity is peaking power and 25 percent is 50 percent load power factor. It is also stated in the Interior Department report, on page 5, that the 50-percent load power factor can be sold for from 7 to 8 mills. This price does not compare favorably with the high load factor power being produced from new generating stations in New England producing power for from 5 to 6 mills. In addition to this, power will not come onto the line until between 1978 and 1980. It will produce less than 1 percent of the total kilowatt hours for New England.

Nobody has convinced me this project could reduce the price of electricity in New England when it would generate such a small part of the total requirement and at prices higher than alternate sources that are paying their full share of taxes and not being financed at taxpayers' expense.

Using the peak prices as stated by the Interior Department in 1965 for the Dickey-Lincoln project and as stated by the Federal Power Commission in 1968 for the Northfield power project, it is evident, despite my friend taking a contrary position before the committee this afternoon, that the benefit-to-cost ratio is in reality less than 1 to 1. It is not 1.9 to 1 as this project's supporters contend.

Because of these facts, and because of the 400-mile transmission line involved costing some \$80 million alone, and because there is very little to be added to the present power reserves by this costly project and because it will not help with the consumer price picture to amount to anything except close by the facility itself. I certainly object to half a billion taxpayer's dollars being spent here. I

hope for this sixth time this House will once and for all, reject this wasteful and unneeded project. This is the more compelling at this critical financial time when we are looking, as members of the Appropriations Committee, for new money sources to help meet some of our most pressing needs in this country, some of which have a vastly greater priority for the public good than the Dickey-Lincoln project.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to cite the statistics in support of the Dickey-Lincoln project because numerous Federal agencies have studied it thoroughly. I would, however, point out especially to the gentleman from New Hampshire, our neighboring State, who just spoke, that there is a power shortage in the United States, and that energy sources are going to have to be examined, and somewhere power resources are going to have to be generated for New England. We have had blackouts of power in New England as well as in other areas of the United States.

With the problems in power and the problems connected with the environment, the plant at Dickey-Lincoln would supply peaking power for New England. It would be of great assistance because it would mean fossil power or nuclear power stations would not need to be put in. So the Dickey-Lincoln is valuable for the State of Maine and for New England, contrary to what has been stated here today.

We would like to say further that the problem has been studied and restudied. The Corps of Engineers is adamant that it has a favorable cost-benefit ratio.

Also I would like to point out that New England—and Maine in particular, a small State facing unemployment—requires additional generating sources, and it does not have a single public power project. This stands out in the light of other developments in the United States. It would seem to me for this small State and for this small amount to be spent this year, it would be best to push this project ahead at this time and it would be best for this Congress at this time.

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

Mr. KYROS. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest sympathy myself for the problems the gentleman has in the great State of Maine. I would like to see a project worked out, as I have told the gentleman many times, which would help his State, but this involves \$480 per kilowatt for peaking power purposes, when the industry generally, both public and private power, does not pay more than \$100 per kilowatt, and it is uneconomical to do that.

I do not think it is proper to ask the taxpayers of the United States to bear a burden of half a billion dollars for construction of this project when it is of the character and at the distance involved. It is for this reason that in the exercise of fiscal responsibility I appeal for rejection of this.

I hope the gentleman understands that.

Mr. KYROS. I respect the views of my friend, the gentleman from New Hampshire. But at the same time I repeat we can sit here and recite statistics, and we would be prepared to show the Dickey-Lincoln project does have a favorable cost-benefit ratio, and its does have the support of the Army Corps of Engineers as a result of their studies.

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

Mr. KYROS. I yield to my colleague from Maine.

Mr. HATHAWAY. I just want to point out to the gentleman from New Hampshire that I do not know where he gets the half billion dollar figure. This was what I was talking about when I was on the floor before. The Zender report, which I mentioned, shows that the cost the Corps of Engineers has come up with for this year is \$267 million, which is not a half billion dollars and is a reasonable cost according to the report. The independent study conducted by the Appropriations Committee 2 or 3 years ago also said that the Corps of Engineers figures were correct.

As I mentioned before, the subcommittee which has been hearing the testimony for the last 5 years said that the Corps of Engineers figures are correct. I believe that the half billion dollar figure is in somebody's imagination and is not the real hard figure everybody else is willing to accept.

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

Mr. KYROS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. I should like to consider the figure of \$267 million which the gentleman mentioned. To that we must add \$101 million for transmission 400 miles to the Boston area. We must also add 2 years of planning, which the Corps of Engineer's testimony in the hearings indicates has a 14-percent escalation. That is \$35 million additional, which makes it \$404 million. In addition to that, there will be 7 years of construction. With the escalation of costs, if we use a 5 percent escalation figure, which is low, that will bring this project to over \$540 million.

The gentleman speaks about a figure of \$267 million for the estimates at the 1969 level, but does not include the transmission figure and does not include the escalated costs. In addition, the Senate document indicates that in all Corps of Engineer projects they underestimate, and they have underestimated their original estimates by as much as 90 percent of the original estimates.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I should like to make inquiry of the distinguished gentleman from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY).

Is it correct that the entire Maine delegation both in the House and in the Senate, both Democrats and Republicans, support this project?

Mr. HATHAWAY. That is true. Also, the former Republican Governor of the State supported the project. Also, President Johnson supported the project, and President Nixon is supporting the project. It has bipartisan support.

Mr. HUNGATE. And this project would be constructed, the basic Dickey-Lincoln School project, in the State of Maine; is that correct.

Mr. HATHAWAY. That is correct. It would also flood some land in Canada.

Mr. HUNGATE. I would ask the gentleman with respect to the construction cost inflation escalation referred to, would the gentleman agree it would have been by the same amount cheaper if it had been constructed some 5 or 6 years ago?

Mr. HATHAWAY. Absolutely; \$218 million was the original authorization figure in 1965, and it would be on the line next year if they had gone ahead with the appropriations the way I believe the House and the Congress should have gone ahead.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. KYROS).

Mr. KYROS. I should like to ask my senior colleague from Maine to discuss the environmental problem which has been raised on the floor today with respect to the Dickey-Lincoln project. We are familiar with our own State. We know what the problems are. I ask my colleague to describe that.

Mr. HATHAWAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I should like to say that some objections have been made by conservationists to the Dickey-Lincoln School power project. As I mentioned earlier, this is the only nonpolluting source of energy. We have that in its favor. In addition to that, it is true that some streams in the State of Maine will be blocked out as a result of constructing that project.

Six streams in the State of Maine will be blocked, and we have 3,600—3,600—streams in the State of Maine. The State of Maine is covered 83 percent or 27,000 square miles with forest land. This project will take one-half of 1 percent of that area. To be sure, anything you do, whether it is building a building or paving a road, you do something to the environment. However, I think that conservationists objection to this project are way out of line, because the damage to the environment will be minimal.

Mr. HUNGATE. Can the gentleman tell me how many streams there are in the State of Maine again?

Mr. HATHAWAY. 3,600.

Mr. HUNGATE. Then, it is fair to say that you have more streams than you have electricity in Maine?

Mr. HATHAWAY. Yes. And also we have 2,000 lakes.

Mr. HUNGATE. We want to be clear on this. The Corps of Engineers makes benefit-cost studies, as I understand it. Sometimes the ratio is favorable and sometimes it is not. In the State of Maine on this Dickey-Lincoln project, is that ratio favorable?

Mr. HATHAWAY. It is extremely favorable. It is almost 2 to 1, at 1.9 to 1. That means the taxpayer will get back \$1.90 for every dollar invested in this project.

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

Mr. HUNGATE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman from Maine, I am sure, is aware of the fact that there is an energy shortage all over the United States. This energy shortage is not limited to electrical energy. The gentleman pointed out that subscribers to Pepco in Washington received notices about when they should run their air conditioning units and all that sort of thing. Do not be surprised if come next winter people all over this area get the same kind of a notice about heating their homes, because we are facing all over the United States now a deficit not only in electrical energy but a deficit in energy provided by gas. It is a very serious deficit. A few years ago we had a continuing argument in the Committee on Ways and Means about the question of coal competing with gas. Today we need every conceivable source of energy available.

I would like to commend the gentleman. He has fought diligently for many years for this project. I think he is on a very sound footing here. I hope the House will approve his amendment and that this time it will be approved in conference.

Mr. HATHAWAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HUNGATE. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in support of the amendment and talk just very briefly about the environmental considerations involved here. There is no assurance that we are going to double the power to production by 80 percent. There is no way you can double your power production without a levy of some kind on the environment. In other words, you install a coal plant or you dig the coal by strip mining but then you deplete the amount of coal available and put smoke into the air. Then, everyone says, "Let us turn to the use of natural gas." People say, "Let us not have the use of either coal or gas; let us have atomic energy plants."

Well, Mr. Chairman, a lot of people do not want atomic energy plants in their communities because of thermal pollution.

The cleanest power production in the world is through the use of water power. There is not any smokestack or ash or other materials put into the air through the use of other fuels. In other words, the water power is renewed every year. Of course through the use of water-power you create a lake or you have a wilderness area which may in some way be affected. But the production of this kind of power is very evident in the West and I would like to see the Northeast have facilities of this kind. Therefore, I see no reason why in view of the cost-benefit ratio it has that this Congress has failed to authorize it to date and I hope it will be authorized today.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Maine.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Moss was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, since I began serving in the House of Representatives, it is difficult to recall a public works project which has been subject to such intense distortion of its merits as the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric project in Maine. Since 1965, when Dickey-Lincoln was authorized by the Congress, private power company opponents have juggled figures in mailings to members of this body, and presented misleading advertising programs in opposition of the project.

It is becoming clear that no amount of fact, logic, or reason is going to raise the level of this debate which has been going on for 5 years. There are really only two facts that count: First, the Dickey-Lincoln School project is fully justified by the standards applied to all public works projects; and second, private power companies in New England will use any means in their efforts to deny consumers in that region an opportunity to lower their electric bills through the development of Dickey-Lincoln.

During previous attempts to get the necessary appropriations for the Dickey-Lincoln School project the distorting tactics of the private power companies have been documented in several instances:

A special staff study by the House Committee on Appropriations on Dickey-Lincoln in 1967 documented the fact that planning for the so-called big 11 loop of powerplants being promoted by the private power companies as an alternative to Dickey-Lincoln consisted of nothing more than one newspaper advertisement.

In 1967, the Electric Coordinating Council of New England, which is the lobbying organization of the private power companies, deliberately distorted a favorable analysis of the Dickey-Lincoln project by the Federal Power Commission and mailed the results to members of Congress. This mailing was sent by Mr. Albert Cree, chairman of the Coordinating Council, who stated that the project would not recover its costs, that it was an inefficient means of producing power, and that it would exceed the costs of alternative power projects. However, when Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, asked the FPC if it had made any such findings, the Commission reported:

The Federal Power Commission has not made any of the above findings. To the contrary, we reported to Senator Ellender that the proposed Dickey-Lincoln School development was well justified and merited early construction.

This conclusion has also been reached by the House Committee on Appropriations, the Senate, the Department of the Interior, and the Corps of Engineers under three administrations. In addition, Dickey-Lincoln School is the only hydroelectric project which has been subjected to a special study by the House Committee on Appropriations, which found the project to be fully justified on all counts.

Again this year, the members of this body are being treated to more distor-

tions of the facts concerning the Dickey-Lincoln School project. A communication which I recently received from an opponent of the Dickey-Lincoln project advances several specious arguments which deserve rebuttal.

This opponent states that nonpolluting benefits of Dickey-Lincoln are of no concern because some 88,000 acres of woodland would be flooded. I would like to point out that Dickey-Lincoln has had the support of several conservation groups including the Izaak Walton League, and that the project was specifically designed to preserve the wild characteristics of the Allagash Waterway, one of the few remaining free-flowing streams in the eastern United States. Of course, there will be flooding of some wilderness acreage, but this is a small price to pay for a project which will not pollute the air, pollute the water, or use up valuable land space in the urban areas of New England for coal, oil, or nuclear powerplants. Hydroelectric power is the only source of energy available today which does not degrade our limited supply of water or pollute our environment, and, in fact, the Corps of Engineers has testified that water releases from Dickey-Lincoln will be used to "flush" out the Aroostock River to ease pollution during the summertime low-water months.

In addition, Dickey-Lincoln School has been designed to provide recreational facilities for fishermen in the reservoir, boat launching ramps, and camping sites, all of which will blend into the wilderness nature of the area.

Another point made by opponents of Dickey-Lincoln is that it would not help relieve power shortages, and that there are adequate power reserves in the New England area. My good friend, Congressman GIALMO says that New England has reserves of 18 percent, according to a report issued by the Office of Emergency Planning on May 5 of this year. However, I obtained that Office's release, and it places the reserve figure at only 15 percent. Furthermore, the fact is that the Northeast region, which includes New York State and the PJM area as well as New England, has reserves of only 13.9 percent, according to the Federal Power Commission. It is misleading to look at reserve power figures for New England alone. As the 1965 blackout demonstrated, the Northeast region is electrically connected and analysis of the ability of electric utilities to meet consumer demands must be made on a regional basis which includes the entire Northeast, not merely New England alone.

In addition, Dickey-Lincoln School, with its peaking power capacity of 730,000 kilowatts, is the ideal project to relieve power shortages. Peaking power is that energy which is needed during heavy periods of demand, the very periods when utilities with low reserves run into trouble. This large block of peaking power is the perfect complement to the large thermal plants being built by utilities in the New England region which provide so-called firm power, but cannot be used economically for peaking purposes. In the event of a power failure, Dickey-Lincoln could provide up to 24

hours of uninterrupted power because of its large reservoir. Thermal plants require hours to warm up; pumped storage plants have small reservoirs; while hydro facilities, such as Dickey-Lincoln, produce large amounts of power at the flip of a switch. When the program of building large thermal plants in New England is on its way toward the end of this decade Dickey-Lincoln School should be there to provide the peaking power necessary to avoid power shortages and blackouts.

The opponents of Dickey-Lincoln have also asserted that the benefit-to-cost ratio of the Dickey-Lincoln project is "vastly" overstated by excluding the cost of transmission lines and cost escalation during the period of construction. Such a statement is absolutely wrong.

Under the terms of Senate Document No. 97, hydroelectric projects to be built by the Corps of Engineers are not required to include transmission costs to arrive at a benefit-to-cost ratio. All projects containing power are subjected to the same tests for economic feasibility, and Dickey-Lincoln School has one of the highest ratios of any project in the public works appropriations bill—1.9 to 1.

But, Dickey-Lincoln is also unique, for the cost of one-half of the transmission facilities is included in the computation of its benefit-to-cost ratio, even though it is not required under Senate Document No. 97 to demonstrate economic feasibility. The Corps of Engineers has evaluated the Dickey-Lincoln project in light of its ability to provide a badly needed backbone transmission system to bring peaking power to southern New England, and has included the transmission system in its evaluation of the project. This is standard procedure for projects whose benefits and costs are measured on an "at market" basis. One half of the line cost is included because there are benefits for the transmission of power by other utilities. Additional revenue will be obtained to defray transmission costs and reduce the costs to be repaid from project power sales.

The Corps of Engineers also pointed out in hearings before the House Committee on Appropriations that a transmission line has been proposed by electric utilities in the region from Boston to Wiscasset, Maine, and into New Brunswick. This line would be used to import power from Canada. Coordinated planning between the Federal Government's transmission lines from Dickey-Lincoln and the proposed line will reduce costs for all parties.

The fact that potential cost increases are not included in the economic justification of the Dickey-Lincoln project is not strange. Under the terms of Senate Document 97, all projects are evaluated in light of current prices, just as Congress has required. Dickey-Lincoln and all projects in the public works appropriations bill are evaluated in the same way.

However, this fact does not stop the opponents of Dickey-Lincoln from continuing to distort and misrepresent its soundness.

For example, it is stated that Dickey-Lincoln could cost as much as \$545 mil-

tion if price escalation is included. Dickey-Lincoln, according to the Corps of Engineers, will cost \$248 million, and this figure is arrived at under the terms of Senate Document 97. If the cost of Dickey-Lincoln rises so will the cost of all other alternative sources of power. The fact is that cost increases have been the greatest for nuclear plants, and if prices be even more feasible when compared to nuclear or fossil-fueled plants.

The staff study by the House Committee on Appropriations in 1967, and all studies by the Federal Power Commission, the Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior have shown that Dickey-Lincoln School will provide lower cost peaking power than any alternative source of generation. The Corps estimates that the peaking power from Dickey-Lincoln will cost only 13 mills per kilowatt hour while a privately financed alternative project would produce peaking power at 17.7 mills per kilowatt hour.

Another misleading statement is that Dickey-Lincoln would cost more than a pumped storage project to build. The construction cost of Dickey-Lincoln would be more than a pumped storage project, but a pumped storage project requires power to pump the water in its operation while Dickey-Lincoln does not. Power for pumped storage plants would be produced by thermal plants and is an operating cost which Dickey-Lincoln does not have. When you add the construction cost of a pumped storage project to the cost of power needed to operate the facility, the net result is that power costs more when produced by a pumped storage plant than when produced by a hydroelectric project such as Dickey-Lincoln School.

The Dickey-Lincoln School project has not been judged by this body on its merits. Its benefit-to-cost ratio is better than just about all the projects in the public works appropriations bill. Its failure to receive appropriations is the result of a carefully contrived lobbying campaign by private power companies who fear any competition from Federal power facilities in New England. If anyone is unaware of what these utilities are doing to defeat this worthy project, I suggest they look at a document which Senator LEE METCALF placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 1 of this year. This document is entitled "A Report for Action on the Dickey-Lincoln School Project," and was prepared by three representatives of New England private utilities in 1965.

The document is a plan of action for defeating Dickey-Lincoln appropriations. To what extent the companies were able to carry out the program as outlined is unknown but their plan included the following:

Private utilities outside of the New England region were to put pressure on their Representatives and Senators;

Cooperative advertising and lobbying campaigns with equipment suppliers, such as Westinghouse, General Electric, Allis Chalmers, Babcock & Wilcox United States Steel, Bethlehem Steel, and Dravo Corp., were proposed. The document indicates that some of these industrial

giants were most helpful in defeating Dickey-Lincoln appropriations.

"Carefully cultivated" articles should be planted in national magazines;

Catchy phrases are recommended such as: "a project way up in Maine," "further study is badly needed," and "there is a conservation issue at stake."

This is exactly the type of activities the companies have used to hold up the Dickey-Lincoln School project. It is time for the House of Representatives to quit yielding to the pressures of these private utilities and give the consumer a break in New England by approving funds for the Dickey-Lincoln School project. If it was not a worthy project, I suspect the companies would not be so worried about its impact. They know that it will force them to face competition for the first time in New England, and that consumers will be able to judge their performance in light of that competition.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge support for this amendment.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Year after year after year, we are faced in this House with the same discredited public power project—the Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric project.

Year after year after year, the House in its wisdom and the Congress in its wisdom have deleted this project. This project cannot make a justifiable case. It has failed to make a case in the past, and it cannot make a case today.

Think of it—they mention the fact that we have a need for additional power in New England. Of course we have, as we have throughout the United States. But I submit that the solution to the power shortages problem is to get lower cost power and not higher cost power. The Dickey-Lincoln is one of the most expensive types of power imaginable.

We need Dickey-Lincoln, they tell us, for peak power electrical needs in the Boston area—in the Boston grid system. So what does the Corps of Engineers propose—to build a hydroelectric plant 400 miles away from the area of need and to spend well over \$100 million in transmission costs through the lovely Maine woods. However, there are alternative methods which can give us the additional power at a much closer position to the Boston area at much lower costs, as in the case of the pump storage plant at Northfield which will produce 1 million kilowatts of electricity at a cost of \$80 million as opposed to \$500 million plus for the Dickey-Lincoln project.

Now I would like to do something for Maine. We hear that Maine has many needs and, admittedly, they do. I think we should be able with all our Federal programs and projects to find some worthwhile project for Maine, but not one which is going to be a burden upon the taxpayers of the United States to the degree of well over a half billion dollars.

This program—and they do not dispute our figures—is the most expensive way of producing power. Unlike the dams in the West, it is not a multipurpose dam—it is not a dam for flood control or

area redevelopment or for reclamation, although they are trying to make a case, I notice, for that this year—but rather a dam solely and primarily for power. Last year it was in the 94-percent bracket for power. This year, I am told, it is in the area of 88 percent. That means 88 percent of its cost must be recovered over a 50-year period. If the cost is \$500 million plus, we are told by the Corps of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission the cost to be recovered will be \$35 million a year. At that rate you will not have a benefit-to-cost ratio anywhere in the vicinity of 1.9 to 1 and you will not have low cost power; you will have the most expensive power imaginable in the New England area.

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

Mr. GIAIMO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman on his statement and I agree with him as I have been with him in all of these debates during the past 5 years.

I pointed out in the debate last year that it seems too bad that the Maine delegation does not use its energy, instead of pursuing this project, which appears manifestly unsound, to accomplish something that will really help northern Maine and really help northern New England and help northern New York—which is an east-west highway. This type of transportation would do more for the northern part of New England than any project such as this one.

I think it is regrettable that for some reason or another the Maine delegation has become transfixed and hypnotized by this monstrosity, which is nothing more than the tail end of the Passamaquoddy project which has been turned down over the years—and this is basically, the remnants of that project. It is too bad. I can understand their desire to do something for their State, but there are other people in northern New England who are very anxious to work with them for major projects which would really improve the entire area. I think the east-west highway that would unite northern New England would be of far more value to the economic development of northern New England than this five-time loser.

Mr. GIAIMO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to point out that Congress is being asked to support this project, yet in the hearings on page 264, part III, the question was put to the Secretary of the Interior:

Does the Department support the project?

In the past the Department of the Interior has supported this project. This project originated with the Secretary of the Interior in 1961 or 1962.

The answer of the Department of the Interior to that question was:

I have never discussed it with the Secretary.

Think of it. The Congress is being asked to support a project which will cost probably in excess of a half billion dollars, and the Department of the Interior still has not taken a position on this project.

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

Mr. TIERNAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The gentleman has made a great bit about the fact that the power source will be 400 miles away from the users. Of course, the gentleman realizes that the whole network of the utilities system in New England have joined together to form the grid, so that what you are talking about is that any electrical energy that can get on that system at any point will serve not only Boston but it will also serve the whole Northeast area at a time when we will most need it, the peak hours when we have the brown-outs and the blackouts.

Not only that, but the New England grid is now being tied in with the Middle Atlantic grid, and that is the whole testimony before the Power Subcommittee with regards to the need to have these systems tied in.

I know that the gentleman has been consistent in his opposition to this project, but I really think if we look back upon the past, if this project had been allowed to go along at the time it was first proposed, we would have that energy coming on the line in 1972, when we are going to need the electrical power more than what even the private utilities can provide for. I just make that point to you. I think in the interest of not only Maine and not only Rhode Island, but all the New England area, and possibly even New York, we should obtain every bit of electric power we can generate which does not pollute our environment—and this is the type we are speaking of. You cannot get this type of power from where you want it. You have to go to where it is generated, and it is generated in that part of the country.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I just want to tell the gentleman that I believe the project has been wrong from its inception. It could not stand the light of facts at that time. It was wrong when it was conceived, and it has been wrong consistently since that time. It is wrong today. There is no sense in carrying this power 400 miles from the place where it would be generated to where it is needed. Bear in mind also that, interestingly enough, the transmission of this power, which will cost over \$100 million, is estimated to last 100 years, while the Federal Power Commission tells us it will have to be replaced after 30 years.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY) to provide \$807,000 in appropriations for fiscal year 1971 for preconstruction planning of the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric power project.

The Dickey-Lincoln project has for a decade or more been bitterly opposed by the private power companies of New England. In past years these companies have argued against the project on the basis that it was economically unsound or that the power produced by the project could not be marketed, or that the project was unnecessary because the private

companies had begun their own program for expanding electric power resources in the region.

The New England States are faced with the certainty of serious power failures within the near future unless additional power capacity is generated. A recent report on the electric utilities in Massachusetts concluded that there will be a reduction in voltage levels up to 10 percent this summer. This reduction will be caused by a totally inadequate power reserve. In fact, it has been estimated that the current reserve of New England's private power companies is about 8 percent and that most, if not all, of this reserve has been continually committed to regions outside of New England. The report states:

Some of the effects that the consumer will feel when the voltage level to his residence or business is reduced by 10 percent is (1) a 30 percent reduction in the light intensity from his incandescent lights, (2) heating equipment will have a near 20% reduction in output, (3) induction motors utilized in many types of appliances will have a near 20 percent reduction in their starting ability and an approximate 12 percent rise in their operating temperature, (4) fluorescent lamps now found in many homes and most commercial establishments will have their life cut by 20 percent besides having unsatisfactory starting and (5) electronic devices such as radios and television sets which are very sensitive to voltage fluctuation, will have a noticeable reduction in picture brilliance and sensitivity.

This means that not only will New England residents be inconvenienced and discomforted by less satisfactory operation of their electrical appliances, but the life-span of those appliances will be considerably reduced, resulting in greater replacement costs to the consumer.

It is interesting to note that less than a month ago a brownout occurred throughout New England during the annual meeting of 2,500 electric utility industry leaders in Boston. Dozens of power companies in the East already have made temporary cuts in system voltage and Boston's major electric utility announced 3 weeks ago that it would reduce voltage production by as much as 5 percent on extremely hot summer days. Millions of consumers will be asked to make voluntary reductions in air conditioner use. The odds are more than even that there will be more blackouts. They are avoidable if we are willing to act. But so far we have not.

The problem is severe enough now. Within the next few years it will be desperate. It has been estimated that between now and 1990 the 11 Northeastern States must build about four times as much electrical generating capacity as the industry has provided thus far in its 80-year history. In short, this will involve an investment of about \$50 billion. The country's energy requirements are expected to increase by 450 percent between 1965 and 1990. Electric generating facilities will have to double in size during each decade just to stay in place.

The Dickey-Lincoln project will generate 1 billion kilowatt hours of power annually and will have an installed capacity of 830 megawatts. It will be primarily a source of so-called "peaking

power" and thereby provide a safeguard against total or partial power failures in New England.

As is well known, electric rates in New England are the highest in the country. An average bill for residential service in 1969 cost the homeowner in New England \$8.38 for 250 kilowatt-hour. In the East South Central region of the country, for the same amount of electricity, a homeowner would pay only \$5.81. A resident of Boston pays more than twice as much for electricity as a resident of Seattle and three times as much as a resident of Eugene, Ore. It has been estimated that a savings of \$36.2 million would be made by consumers in New England if their electric bills were the same as the national average.

Commercial consumers of electricity in New England pay up to 50 percent more than the national average for commercial consumption. According to some estimates, industrial power costs in New England are 60 percent higher than the average industrial costs for the rest of the country. If New England's costs had been on a par with the national average, New England's manufacturing industries, according to a 1962 study, would have saved \$71.4 million on their power bills.

The private power companies of New England have proven over a long period of time their ability to influence political action to protect their own position. Throughout our section of the country, these companies hold a virtual monopoly over the supply of electric power. Despite the fact that these companies have been, in effect, privately owned public utilities, they have failed to exhibit any interest in or concern for the needs of the great mass of citizens in New England.

In many States the agencies who have the responsibility for regulating the private power industry have totally failed to do their job. Some of these agencies have become mere echoes of the industry's position. Thus, in many areas, particularly New England, there is no authority to which the citizens may turn to require even one ounce of corporate responsibility from either their government or the industries in the electric power field.

We are warned by the companies that the Dickey-Lincoln project is a threat to the viability of private electric industries. It should be remembered, however, that these companies have a net profit far above the average for a normal business. Boston Edison Co., for example, last year made a net profit of 12.5 cents from every dollar of revenue collected.

Some of that profit goes into influencing State and Federal officials to vote against any legislation which the industry considers against its interests. Recently, a confidential report circulated among the private power companies was obtained through court order. This report set out an extensive campaign against the Dickey-Lincoln School project which obviously entailed a great deal of money. A portion of this report called for the establishment by each private electric company of a budget for travel and expenses to lobby against the proj-

ect and called for a separate contribution for the purposes of congressional receptions.

A staff study by the House Committee on Appropriations found that Dickey-Lincoln would provide electric power at a lower cost than any other means of generation. It has been estimated that when it is constructed, \$9 million a year would be saved by consumers in the region as a direct result of low-cost power from the project. It can also be assumed that the presence of a Federal power source, generating electricity at comparatively low costs, will bring private electric rates down. It is the fear of such a reduction which motivates the private power companies in their hostility to the project.

I am fully aware, Mr. Speaker, that opposition to this project has become concentrated on the issue of preserving our environment. It is obvious to anyone that the natural environment of this area in Maine will be drastically changed by the construction of the Dickey-Lincoln project. Nevertheless, if the Dickey-Lincoln project is not funded today and not constructed within the next 2 years, you can be sure that the exasperation caused by power failures and the problems caused by higher priced power will force the construction of other types of electric power generating facilities. The Dickey-Lincoln project, of course, uses water as the source of generating power. Thus, it is nonpolluting when compared to all other known methods of accomplishing the same purpose. From an environmental point of view, we are better off with Dickey-Lincoln than we would be with its alternatives.

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

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

Mr. KYROS. Is it not a fact that although the gentleman from Connecticut who just spoke against the amendment for the project stated that the Secretary of the Interior—and I imagine he refers to Mr. Hickel—has not taken a position on the project. Is it not a fact that his superior, the President of the United States, Mr. Nixon, has taken a position supporting the project?

Mr. HARRINGTON. To my knowledge he has. I am not so sure that that is necessarily to be translated into effective support by the minority party.

Mr. KYROS. The gentleman from Connecticut stated that this power generated in Maine would have to travel 400 miles to its place of use. Is it not a fact that oil travels into New England, coal travels into New England, and the uranium rods for a nuclear plant have to travel hundreds and hundreds of miles, for them to get there?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am frankly appalled that still another effort should be made to include the thoroughly discredited Dickey project in this public works appropriation bill.

Four years ago this House was subjected to what can only be called shenanigans on the part of the other body when the papers on the bill were literally stolen and the House later found itself

in a position to only vote up or down the entire public works bill.

Thereafter, the House rejected Dickey-Lincoln's separate authorization by record vote in 1965. It was obtained later by an unparliamentary maneuver at the conference stage. Since then, the House has cast four record votes against appropriation of any construction planning funds for Dickey-Lincoln. The last House vote against it was 265 to 132.

It is particularly galling to hear references to the fact that this project was once approved and questions raised as to why it has not been subsequently funded. There are very clear answers to that question. If this ballgame had been played by the rules 5 years ago, the project would not have been funded at all.

I refuse to take the time of the House at any length to discuss the merits of this project because there are none. I do not intend to recite a litany of reasons against the project because they are so well known that it would produce the ultimate in boredom.

Here we stand in an inflationary economy, spiraling Federal spending, mounting Federal debt, and pressing social problems with far higher priorities and we discuss this useless half-billion-dollar project. To paraphrase it can be accurately described as one in which "never would so much be spent by so many for so few."

Mr. Chairman, I also submit the following information in connection with the Dickey-Lincoln project:

**PROPOSED DICKEY-LINCOLN POWER PROJECT REASONS REPEATEDLY REJECTED**

The proposed Dickey-Lincoln power project, on the upper St. John River in northern Maine, was designed by the Army Engineers as part of the old Passamaquoddy tidal power project—which the Interior Department discarded as decidedly uneconomic in 1965.

Thereafter, the House rejected Dickey-Lincoln's separate authorization by record vote in 1965. It was obtained later by an unparliamentary maneuver at the conference stage. Since then, the House has cast four record votes against appropriations of any construction planning funds for Dickey-Lincoln. The late House vote against it was 265 and 132.

The Corps of Engineers has again requested Congress to provide funds for Dickey-Lincoln construction planning, \$807,000, in the Public Works Appropriation bill for 1971. As shown by repeated House debate on Dickey-Lincoln, the reasons for its rejection in the past, and again today, are:

**Location and capability.**—The proposed Dickey-Lincoln Power Project would be located in the northernmost part of Maine more than 400 miles from the major New England load centers which it would be built primarily to serve.

The output from this proposed project, if built, would be contributing less than 6/10ths of 1% of all of New England's electrical needs.

**Construction cost.**—Dickey-Lincoln's estimated first cost would be not less than \$407 million. When this cost is escalated at a minimum of 5% for 7 years (the time required to complete construction) its cost including

the necessary transmission facilities would not be less than \$545 million taxpayer dollars.

**Conservation—opposition.**—As shown by the Federal-State Inter-Agency report on New England water resources, Dickey-Lincoln would destroy "the only remaining unspoiled wilderness area in northeastern United States," and inflict "severe, large and permanent" damage to fish and wildlife (S. Doc. 14, 85th Cong.).

It is opposed by numerous national and regional conservation organizations, including: Appalachian Mountain Club, Maine Audubon Society, Maine Fish and Game Clubs, Massachusetts Audubon Society, National Wildlife Federation, Natural Resources Council of Maine, New England Advisory Board on Fish and Game Problems, Sierra Club, State Biologists Association of Maine, and Wilderness Society.

**Dickey-Lincoln costs to consumers.**—Due to its huge final cost (\$545 million), and the requirement that the Federal project power costs be repayed within 50 years, Dickey-Lincoln would produce very high-cost electricity. As shown by FPC's manual, Dickey-Lincoln's power would cost the New England consumers at least \$35 million a year. FPC found that industry's total cost of providing alternative power in New England is only \$17 million a year, plus \$5 million a year in tax payments to local communities, state and Federal government.

Due to the high-cost of its power, Dickey-Lincoln would have the effect of increasing rather than decreasing the electric costs in New England.

**Reserve generating capacity 1970-1980.**—The generating capability of the New England companies for the summer of 1970 will be 12,624,000 kilowatts compared to the estimated summer peak load of 10,355,000 kilowatts, leaving a reserve margin of 18%.

This 18% margin of reserve generating capacity exceeds the 15% reserve requirement specified by the Federal Power Commission, FPC Release 16755, N.E. Regional Report, p. 2, May 1970.

New England companies in 1980 (when the proposed Dickey-Lincoln Project would be scheduled for completion, if authorized) would have a generating capability of 31,761,000 kilowatts and an estimated peak load of 25,903,000 kilowatts leaving a 22.6% reserve margin.

**Ratio.**—Dickey-Lincoln does not have a favorable benefit-cost ratio. The Federal-State Inter-Agency reported that a hydroelectric project at the Dickey-Lincoln site would have an unfavorable benefit-cost ratio of 0.7 to 1. The Army Engineers' statement that Dickey-Lincoln would have a favorable ratio was based on a substantial understatement of its cost.

**Conclusion.**—There should be no appropriation to revive construction planning of the destructive, inflationary, and high cost Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric project.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say at the end this lifeless lemon should remain squeezed out of the budget—as has been correctly done by our Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure all members of the Committee have felt they have been here before—and so we have. This project has been around for a long time. In 1965 it was authorized. The Subcom-

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, *Public Works for Water, Pollution Control, and Power Development and Atomic Energy Commission Appropriation Bill, 1971*, hearings before Subcommittee on Public Works, Part 1, pp. 438-41.

<sup>2</sup> U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, *Public Works for Water, Pollution Control, and Power Development and Atomic Energy Commission Appropriation Bill, 1971*, hearings before Subcommittee on Public Works, Part 5, pp. 992-994.

mittee on Public Works, has funded it a few times during that 5-year period.

As a matter of fact, the previously allocated funds for the Dickey-Lincoln School project amounted to around \$2,154,000.

The budget request for this year—submitted by the President of the United States—is \$807,000 to resume planning.

There would be an additional requirement after fiscal year 1971 of \$639,000 to complete planning.

After planning is completed, the project can move into the construction phase. The project would be contracted out in one or two major contracts so there will be no continual escalation in price that Members have been talking about today. We will have escalation of prices perhaps for the next 2 years, but we will have the same escalation of prices for electric plants built by private utilities.

So this project, in view of the subcommittee, continues to be an important factor in the resolution of the high power cost and the power shortage that we face in New England.

A review and evaluation of this project

by this subcommittee indicates that it is well justified economically, and confirms that the project is economically sound, that there is no more economical alternative means of obtaining equivalent benefits.

In spite of the contention of those who have opposed construction of this project previously, and still oppose it, detailed reviews by the House appropriations investigating team, the Federal Power Commission, and the Department of the Interior found the project to be sound and justified.

No known information has been offered that should or can alter these basic conclusions. A market exists and will continue to exist, for consumption of the power production.

Edison Electric Institute Statistical Yearbook for 1968, clearly indicates that the power rates continue to exceed the national average by a substantial amount in the New England area. For example, for residential power, Maine and Massachusetts exceed the national average by 21 and 32 percent, respectively, and rank 5 and 6 respectively in the Nation for high cost power.

crue revenues for another 50 years totaling about \$1 billion after meeting operation and maintenance costs.

If the cost of transmission line was reduced even 50 percent through revenues from nonproject uses or utilization of private utility facilities, as I assume would occur if the project is built, the cost per kilowatt-hour at market could be reduced to 15 mills compared with the 17.7 mills figure for the cheapest alternative plants.

Much has been made of the opposition of the conservationists. I believe the consumers, too, are entitled to some consideration by this committee and by this Congress. The consumer councils in all the New England States that I know of favor the project. It is one of the leading projects of the Massachusetts Consumers Council.

The conservationists, I believe, are incorrect when they say that this project would destroy that area. As the gentleman from Maine, who has labored so long and so hard for this project, said, there are about 35,000 streams in Maine, and hundreds and hundreds of lakes. Opposition to this project is based upon the fact that there will be too much fluctuation in the streams.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BOLAND was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BOLAND. The opposition of the conservationists is that there will be large daily fluctuations in water levels. This is not so. The fluctuations would not be more than fractions of inches in any one particular day. The project is designed to protect the Allagash River. This is one of the wild rivers in New England and perhaps the only wild river in Maine. The protection of the Allagash and making it possible to dam the St. Johns River will provide a reservoir for fishing in the St. Johns and for stream fishing in the Allagash. So the damage to the ecology and to the environment is of little or no significance in this particular project.

The question has been raised here, however, and this is a good year to raise it, of course, because it is the year of Earth Day and of environment and ecology. And it all catches on.

So I ask you to support the subcommittee in the \$807,000 that it recommended and the Bureau of the Budget and the President of the United States support. Let us get along with planning on this project. I fervently hope that this committee will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, during the debates over the years on this project, I have raised many points on many occasions. I will not repeat all of them now. They are a matter of record, and the whole record speaks for itself. The Dickey-Lincoln School project has been voted down five times. It is a five-time loser, because it is not an economically sound solution to New England's power and energy problems. Taxpaying utilities can produce the same amount of electricity for about one-

POWER RATES OF NEW ENGLAND (1968)

	Residential		Commercial		Industrial	
	Cents per kilowatt-hour	Percent above U.S. average	Cents per kilowatt-hour	Percent above U.S. average	Cents per kilowatt-hour	Percent above U.S. average
U.S. average	2.25		2.08		0.98	
Connecticut	2.52	7	2.28	10	1.34	37
Maine	2.74	21	2.77	33	1.14	16
Massachusetts	2.96	32	2.56	24	1.48	51
New Hampshire	2.79	24	2.91	41	1.36	38
Rhode Island	2.86	27	2.33	12	1.52	56
Vermont	2.24		2.37	14	1.45	48

There have been various figures mentioned today as to the cost of this project, and I have heard them for the past five years.

I want to recall to the Members of this Committee that I opposed this project when it was first suggested to the Congress 5 years ago, because in my judgment an independent study had never been made as to whether or not this was a sound, economically feasible, project, with a favorable benefit to cost ratio.

Subsequently our Subcommittee on Public Works did request the investigations staff of the full House Appropriations Committee, to determine where the truth lay. We found out. The investigations staff came back and indicated that the benefit to cost ratio was at least 1.5 to 1. That is a good benefit to cost ratio. It is as good as those power projects in many areas of the United States—in Kansas, Alabama, Arkansas, North Dakota, Missouri, or in the great States of Washington or California. So this project measures up so far as the benefit to cost ratio is concerned. It is feasible. It is sound.

The Corps of Engineers indicated that the cost this year is \$248 million. My friend from Connecticut mentioned that the cost of the transmission line will be around \$100 million, and he is justified in doing it. The actual cost is \$96.8 million, as I recall.

So it is an expensive project. But all huge hydroelectric projects are expensive. I can point to some of them out in

the great Northwest that were many times as costly as this one. But they are all paying out, with interest.

All we are doing here is asking the Members of this Committee to give us a hydroelectric project in New England. We do not have a Federal hydroelectric project in New England. We have never had one. If this one is approved and built, it will probably be the only one we will have, because it is the only location in New England where a hydroelectric plant of this size can be built.

It has been claimed that it will require power revenues annually of \$35 million to repay the cost of the Dickey-Lincoln project over the 50-year repayment period. This apparently assumes cost escalation of 5 percent over a 6½-year period and other increased costs. However, the yearly cost estimate given for private alternative plants of \$22 million is not comparable as it includes no cost escalation factor.

Based on the latest FPC data, the Dickey-Lincoln School project can provide 17.4 mills per kilowatt-hour power at market as compared to a 17.7 mills per kilowatt-hour cost of alternative plants with an annual savings in power costs of \$500,000, or \$25 million over the 50-year repayment period.

The life of the Dickey-Lincoln hydro-power project is estimated at 100 years compared with only 35 years for alternative plants with high fuel and maintenance costs. Once paid for at the end of 50 years, Dickey-Lincoln would ac-

fifth of the initial cost of this tax-eating project.

They can produce cheaper electricity and still pay local, State, and Federal taxes. The rates they charge consumers are regulated. A few weeks ago we voted to get the Federal Government out of the Post Office. Why should we turn around now and put the Federal Government further into the electricity-producing business, in an area where tax-paying public utilities are performing acceptably.

This uneconomical project would ruin acres of wilderness area that should be left in their natural state. In addition, it would be necessary to clear a swath 300 feet wide for some 400 miles in length from northern Maine, through New Hampshire, and into Massachusetts for the electric transmission lines to take most of the electricity produced by the project to the Boston area. In Maine, this would strip thousands of acres of land. In New Hampshire the 300-foot strip would occupy some thousands of acres of land in an area where land is in great demand. Furthermore, it would remove this land from the tax rolls and would create an eye-sore for residents and tourists in recreation and conservation-oriented areas.

We who represent districts in northern New England know that in order to achieve economic growth, we need better transportation. How much better it would be if the \$500 million plus that this project would cost were to be spent on several hundred miles of through-way, than for an uneconomical power project. Gentlemen, electric rates are not holding back economic development in northern New England, but lack of good highways, particularly east-west ones, are.

In order to justify the project, the proponents tell you that the electric rates are preventing economic growth in northern New England. Mr. Chairman, the latest Federal Power Commission report shows that this is not correct. Industrial rates in my area for most customers are below the national average, and for residential customers we are only paying 10 percent above the entire national average. From this it is clear that some other regions are paying more dearly for power than northern New England.

Mr. Chairman, there is no way that this uneconomical project which could produce less than 1 percent of the electricity that will be used in the New England area can reduce rates or be of any significant benefit. Therefore, I once again urge you to vote against it; hopefully for the sixth and last time.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, throughout the long years of controversy over the Dickey-Lincoln power project in Maine, it has been repeatedly stated that the Corps of Engineers has grossly underestimated construction costs. I believe that to be the case. But it is only a portion of the injustice this project could work against the taxpayers, for the corps has adhered to its usual practice of also grossly understating the portion of the project's cost attributable to power. The

net result of this will be to provide a sizable subsidy to the power users at the expense of the taxpayers.

In a project such as Dickey-Lincoln which has been authorized to serve several purposes, including flood control and power production, it is necessary to allocate the cost of joint-use facilities among the several functions to be served by the project. In making such an allocation of joint costs, the Corps of Engineers uses the cost of building a Federal powerplant of the same size as a basis of comparison. The plant usually used by the corps in this process is a federally constructed steamplant; not a single-purpose federally constructed hydroelectric project. But—and it's a multimillion dollar but—the Comptroller General of the United States in a report to Congress on May 25 severely criticized this practice by the corps.

The Comptroller General reasoned that the corps' method "is inappropriate because the Congress has not authorized the construction of federally financed steamplants outside the area served by TVA."

The Comptroller General developed this point further, saying:

The alternative used should be a real alternative—one that could and would likely be undertaken in the absence of the project."

The Comptroller General concluded:

An appropriate alternative for power could be a single-purpose federally financed hydroelectric plant, which, incidentally, is the power alternative used by the Federal Power Commission (FPC) in its cost allocations.

The problem that I am discussing here is not merely a question of theory. The General Accounting Office—an agency of the Congress—painstakingly studied 20 multiple-purpose Federal hydroelectric projects to determine how much money is being lost to the Treasury through this glaringly deficient policy of the corps. For these 20 projects, the corps allocated only about \$561,000,000 to the cost of power producing facilities, using a Federal steamplant as the basis of comparability. If the allocation had been made properly, on the basis of the cost of a single-purpose Federal hydroelectric project, as recommended by the Comptroller General and used by the Federal Power Commission, the allocation to power would have been \$696,000,000—about \$135,000,000 more. The Comptroller General stated:

This underallocation represents about 24 percent of the nearly \$682 million that the Corps has allocated to the power features of these 20 projects. Conversely, the costs allocated to other project purposes, such as water supply, irrigation, recreation, and flood control have been overstated. The costs allocated to power, water and irrigation are reimbursable to the Federal Government. The costs allocated to purposes such as recreation and flood control are not reimbursable.

I am talking here about dollars that should have flowed back to the Treasury—back to the taxpayers. But on these 20 projects, not only will the amount of the underestimate, more than \$134,000,000, be lost to the Treasury; in addition, power users will be escaping the financing charges on this sum. Instead, the

taxpayers will be paying both the interest and principal on this underestimated amount.

Now, what about Dickey-Lincoln?

The corps has applied this same discredited method of cost allocation to the Dickey-Lincoln project. Should this project be built, the rates for its power, in all probability, will be inadequate to cover the true power costs with interest as estimated by the method recommended by the Comptroller General. This would mean that a large portion of the real cost of power produced at this project will be borne by the taxpayers.

Obviously, the Comptroller General's study raises grave doubts—doubts so serious as to warrant rejection of the requested planning funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY).

The question was taken; and the chairman being in doubt, the committee, divided, and there were—ayes 46, noes 76.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HATHAWAY and Mr. GALMO.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 60, noes 90.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

It is a pleasure to endorse the action of the Public Works Committee in the committee action on H.R. 18127, the public works for water, pollution control, and power development and atomic energy commission appropriation bill, 1971. I believe that this is a well balanced bill and provides much needed action by the Federal Government for projects that are necessary for the security and progress of the country.

I would like to point out particularly my strong support and the urgent need for two flood control projects in western Pennsylvania: Chartiers Creek construction and Saw Mill Run, Pittsburgh.

The committee bill contains \$5,700,000 for construction for Chartiers Creek for fiscal year 1971, which is the approved budget request. I believe that this amount is absolutely necessary to make adequate progress toward flood control protection for the important Chartiers Valley in western Pennsylvania, its people, homes, industries, and towns.

I am urging the House to accept the amount of \$30,000 under general investigation recommended by the Committee on Appropriations for the flood control project for Saw Mill Run, Pittsburgh, Pa. This project involves the south part of the city of Pittsburgh and 13 communities which are drained by Saw Mill Run. Both the word "creek" and "run" in our part of the country are used to designate what would be called small rivers in some States. These watersheds contain tens and hundreds of square miles of territory and tens of thousands of people who live and work in towns, villages, factories, and businesses along the banks of these streams.

Having been a life long resident of my district, I know personally of the many

recurring floods of major importance causing extensive damage in the Chartiers Valley area, and the Saw Mill Run section of Allegheny County.

I recommend prompt action and full funds as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and the House Appropriations Committee for the two flood control projects in western Pennsylvania—\$30,000 for the purpose of study and general investigation for Saw Mill Run and \$5,700,000 for construction for Chartiers Valley.

As I have prepared formal statements which I have presented to the House Appropriations Committee and are found on pages 624 and 625 of the hearings before this committee, I am reading these into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that the Congress will know of the urgency for action and the need, and danger to which the people living in the Chartiers Valley basin and the Saw Mill Run area are subject, and the losses which they face every year.

**STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JAMES G. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA BEFORE THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ON CONSTRUCTION OF CHARTIERS VALLEY FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT**

I join with the U.S. Army Engineers in strongly recommending the inclusion of the budget figure of \$5,700,000 for continuation of construction of the Chartiers Creek flood control project in Pennsylvania for fiscal 1971.

Chartiers Creek, a tributary of the Ohio River, is located within Washington and Allegheny Counties, southwestern Pennsylvania. The project will provide flood protection for a distance of about 13 miles in the Carnegie-Bridgeville area of Allegheny County and almost 5 miles in the Canonsburg-Houston area in Washington County.

The communities being protected are established and well developed. The valley is primarily industrial and an important part of the Greater Pittsburgh industrial complex. The stream reaches considered for flood protection are bordered by many industrial concerns, commercial buildings, and residential areas located in low-lying areas. Large numbers of people are affected either directly or indirectly due to frequent flooding. The second highest flood of record occurred as recent as 1956; a recurrence of this flood would cause damages of almost \$10 million for Carnegie-Bridgeville and about \$1,400,000 for Canonsburg-Houston. Flooding also occurred six times since 1956 causing severe damages.

Funds in the amount of \$4,699,000 have been allocated to date for the project. These funds have permitted substantial progress on unit 1 of the Carnegie-Bridgeville reach of the project, a start on unit 2 in the same reach, and completion of unit 1 in the Canonsburg-Houston reach. The budget amount of \$5,700,000 will significantly advance construction on this important project.

**STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JAMES G. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA BEFORE THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ON SAW MILL RUN FLOOD CONTROL STUDY**

I join with the U.S. Army Engineers in strongly recommending the inclusion of the budget figure of \$30,000 for resumption of survey of the Saw Mill Run flood control project in Pennsylvania for fiscal 1971.

Saw Mill Run, with an estimated basin population of about 170,000 divided among the city of Pittsburgh and adjacent communities, is a minor tributary of the Ohio River. Development along the run is continuous throughout its length, with many artificial restrictions and encroachments. Saw Mill Run has a long record of frequent flooding

varying from the nuisance-type floods to major inundations. Damage of substantial amounts occurs with seemingly increasing frequency due to the continuous deterioration of the streambed and adjacent walls and banks. Much inconvenience is experienced during high water periods in this highly populated area in addition to interruption of traffic on two heavily traveled highways in the stream valley. Requests for flood relief have constantly been made throughout the years by local interests.

The survey investigation was initiated in fiscal year 1962 and continued through fiscal year 1964. In May 1964 it was learned that the Pennsylvania Highway Department was planning a highway system to relieve bottlenecks in the Saw Mill Run area. The proposed highway construction would substantially change the physical condition of the area, particularly between the Fort Pitt Tunnel and the intersections of Routes 88 and 51. Therefore, the study was terminated until such time as the Pennsylvania Highway Department could furnish a firm design of the highway improvement so that a flood control study could be coordinated. Preliminary plans for the proposed highway improvement will soon be available. The budget amount of \$30,000 will permit resumption of the Saw Mill Run flood control study coordinated with the proposed highway improvement program.

**AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANDGREBE**

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANDGREBE: On page 7, line 24, after the word "Army", insert a colon, and the following words: "Provided further, with respect to the Lafayette Reservoir in Indiana, an amount not to exceed \$500,000 shall be appropriated to provide for advanced geological and engineering studies affecting the feasibility, desirability, and necessity of the project and that no funds allocated for construction shall be expended until these studies have been completed."

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer relates to the Lafayette Reservoir in Indiana and stems from my deep concern over the future development of this area and in taking responsible action to insure the prosperity of the region.

My amendment would hold in abeyance the funds allocated for the initiation of construction of this reservoir. It does not delete these funds, but would keep them available until more advanced and detailed studies, including a geological study, is completed and a favorable report made public.

At the present time, no construction has begun and no land has been acquired for this 16,000-acre reservoir. To the best of my knowledge only preliminary surveys have been made.

While I do not mean in any way to reflect upon the Corps of Engineers expertise and judgment, there is considerable evidence available, gathered by professional and university people in the area, that more detailed and extensive studies should be made before the initial construction should begin.

These I suggest are the points to be studied—points which have not been fully considered in the surveys which have been made to date:

First. An intensive geological survey: This kind of survey is needed and should be made of the entire area to determine just where the sand and gravel lie be-

low the surface. If these areas are not determined and not sealed by laying down clay, then when the reservoir is built water will seep into this gravel and sand and considerable damage could occur, undermining homes and roads in this heavily populated area. The Corps of Engineers has done a geological study of the damsite, but not a detailed geological study like I have mentioned.

This is the most important reason for my amendment. Preliminary studies by Purdue University experts reveal the existence of gravel and sand beds throughout the general region. If this is so, the area is in danger if the reservoir is completed as planned. Dr. Kohnke of Purdue University has estimated the silt-in to be 1 percent per year. This means that in 100 years, there would be no reservoir.

Second. There has been no upper watershed management in this area. And this is vital for decreasing the silting in the region. It seems to me we have turned around our priorities in this instance. Watershed management should begin first before construction on the reservoir, not the reverse. This is a subject which needs to be investigated and which has already had some consideration by the people in the area. This watershed management could be undertaken under the Soil Conservation Service—Public Law 566—and would be vital in preventing the loss of soil which in turn would reduce the silting.

Three. Finally, further study needs to be made of the economic impact of this reservoir on the area. If the reservoir goes through as planned, as much as 23,000 acres of land will be removed from the tax rolls and, in my estimation and others who have studied this problem, Tippecanoe County, an important part of my Second District will be the loser. Thousands of acres of rich farmland will be taken out of production. Further study needs to be made of the economic impact upon the people in the area—what specific economic and recreational benefits will be derived if any. To date, this has not been done.

In fact, even its flood control value has not yet been clearly defined nor has a solution to the pollution of Wildcat Creek been forthcoming.

In order to provide the needed funds for carrying out these further studies, my amendment appropriates an amount not to exceed \$500,000 to initiate these advanced geological and engineering studies in lieu of the \$800,000 line item in H.R. 18127.

In my estimation we just cannot begin the construction of this \$41 million reservoir until these questions have been satisfactorily answered. In brief, what I am saying in this amendment is that funds for construction of the Lafayette Reservoir should be withheld until more detailed and extensive studies are completed. I, therefore, ask your wholehearted support for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(On request of Mr. RHODES, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LANDGREBE was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

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

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana has made a very important statement, and made some points about this project which had not come to the attention of the committee. I can assure the gentleman, because I know he represents the district in which this project is to be located, that certainly it is not the wish or the desire of this subcommittee or the committee to build any project in the district of a Member which that Member does not desire.

The gentleman has asked for further studies concerning the underpinnings of the dam to make sure that it will not leak, and the gentleman has asked for other studies which come from, as I gather, from knowledge gained by some very competent people at Purdue University.

I would like to say to the gentleman, however, that I have never known the Corps of Engineers to build a dam that leaked. However, they may have.

However, the points which he raises are such that I believe it would behoove me, in fact, I would certainly insist—and I will insist—that the Corps of Engineers satisfy the Committee on Appropriations that these points have been considered and have been cleared up before they proceed to expend the funds which are provided in this bill for construction.

I hope the gentleman, however, will withdraw his amendment because we have no indication as to how much money these studies might take. There are funds available to the Corps of Engineers to make these studies and it would certainly be my intention as one member of the committee to insist that they do that before expending any further funds.

Mr. LANDGREBE. I have great respect for the gentleman from Arizona, and if he would give me—in fact I think he has given me this assurance that these studies will be made and that answers will be given to these questions which I posed in my formal remarks before proceeding with the purchase of land or the construction of the dam—and if that is what the gentleman's answer is implying in his comments, I will accept that.

Mr. RHODES. Would the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN)?

Mr. LANDGREBE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN).

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to say to the gentleman speaking for this side that we concur in the statement made by my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona, and we will be glad to join the gentleman in seeing that such action is taken.

Mr. LANDGREBE. With that assurance from the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Arizona, I will withdraw my amendment.

But first I would like to make some brief comments.

My amendment was offered in good faith. There are fine, responsible people in the Lafayette, Ind., area who do ask serious questions and I will expect the committee to review and to be sure that they have these questions answered to their complete satisfaction before the money is released for construction.

Mr. RHODES. The gentleman from Indiana has that assurance.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, last Saturday, June 20, I had the pleasure of visiting the Batavia, Ill., site of the 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator at the National Accelerator Laboratory with the Honorable CHET HOLFIELD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. We discussed plans, programs and progress of the accelerator and the entire laboratory with Dr. Robert R. Wilson, the laboratory director and Dr. Edwin L. Goldwasser, the deputy director.

I would like to take this opportunity to briefly review the history, progress and predictions for this facility, the National Accelerator Laboratory, which will have the most energetic proton beam available in the world.

On January 26, 1965, President Johnson sent to the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy a study entitled, "Policy for National Action in the Field of High Energy Physics." The report recommended—and I quote:

Construction of a high energy proton accelerator of approximately 200 Bev, in accordance with technical specifications developed by Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, to be operated as a national facility. This machine should be authorized for design in fiscal year 1967, and for construction in fiscal year 1968.

During the initial deliberations on the proposed accelerator, the Joint Committee, being well aware of the fact that European scientists were discussing the possibility of building a 300-Bev facility, insisted that provisions be incorporated in designing the U.S. accelerator to permit an increased energy beam in future years without major modifications or major cost; that is, major relative to initial cost.

In the course of the AEC authorization hearings for fiscal year 1969, Dr. Wilson stated that not only had his staff been able to design the machine to reach its original intensity goal of 30 trillion protons per pulse, but that they had also incorporated an option to go to a higher energy than 200 Bev at a later date. On June 20, 1970, Dr. Wilson told us that the magnets designed for the main accelerator ring will be sufficiently flexible in operation to allow the acceleration of protons to energies of 500 Bev, although at reduced beam intensities. Continuous operation at 500 Bev with high-intensity beams should be possible

with state of the art cryogenic magnets several years from now.

We also learned that in spite of the austere construction budgets of the past several years, and that proposed for fiscal year 1971, the first beam can be obtained by July 1971—if there is a continued absence of major labor problems. It should be noted, however, that by July 1971 the main laboratory building and the large experimental areas will not be completed. Nevertheless, there will be sufficient facilities available to perform meaningful and unique experiments which will be possible only at or slightly above 200 Bev and only at the U.S. National Accelerator Laboratory.

While the 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator at the National Accelerator Laboratory was fully authorized in Public Law 91-44, which was the fiscal year 1970 AEC Authorization Act, the Joint Committee has continued its interest in observing the progress of this outstanding project. Aside from the fine technological progress that I just reported was being made, in spite of operating budgets which are significantly reduced below those desired to keep development and construction within the original time schedule, the human impact is equally significant. At this time, I would like to focus on the human aspects of the work at the laboratory.

Since the inception of the laboratory, a sustained and successful effort has been made to recruit, train, and employ young people from minority groups in the ghettos. About 50 have been involved in the past 2 years and more than 40 are now employed. Similar summertime motivational programs were established as "youth opportunity programs" to demonstrate the advantages of studying for future employment in the scientific and technological fields. We can all take pride in the successes achieved by these programs.

Efforts to get black small business owners to bid for contracts have also been quite successful. For example, over 40 percent of the contracts below \$10,000 for work in the old village of Weston, Ill., which is being adapted to laboratory needs, went to black-owned small businesses in the period September 1969 to March 1970. In April 1970 the laboratory announced the award of two contracts with a potential value of nearly \$600,000 to a black-owned manufacturing company on Chicago's south side. They represent the largest contracts awarded by the laboratory to date to a minority entrepreneur and are equivalent to the largest contract value awarded by the laboratory to any single supplier in the Greater Chicago metropolitan area.

The third factor I would like to mention is open housing. Since the selection of the laboratory site, 54 cities, towns, and villages, of which 35 are within 30 miles of the site, have passed fair housing ordinances. I consider this to be an outstanding response to the promise made that housing would be available to all.

I point to these three activities because of their impact on the socioeconomic side of science.

I respectfully submit that the funds

requested for appropriation for the National Accelerator Laboratory for fiscal year 1971 are the absolute minimum that can be voted without seriously curtailing the entire laboratory program. I urge your continued support of this program.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if I can have the attention of some member of the distinguished subcommittee, I have one or two inquiries that I would like to make.

I would like to commend the committee for its concern with the impact on the environment of many of these activities. But I see no discussion in the committee report of the effect on the environment of the weapons testing program of the AEC such as has been carried on at Amchitka, Alaska.

I note in the committee report the total figure for the weapons programs is \$829,260,000.

I wonder if some gentleman from the subcommittee could enlighten me as to how much of that figure is for the weapons testing program as such?

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

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman has brought up a very important point. I understand AEC is proceeding to comply with the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and will submit the required environmental statements and reports.

This statute requires, if I may proceed—

Mr. BINGHAM. I did not get to that point yet.

I just asked what the figure was for the weapons testing program—what part of this \$829 million that is given in the committee bill is the weapons program figure.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that a substantial amount is involved, about \$200 million in total.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

I notice there is a reference to a specific reduction in the weapons testing program of \$8 million—but no statement as to the total amount.

I would like to call the committee's attention to the fact that under legislation adopted by this Congress, Public Law 91-190, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the agency which requests action on legislation which would have a major environmental impact is required to submit a statement with regard to the effect of that action on the environment—that is the environmental impact.

I understand that the statement in regard to the weapons testing program proposed for underground testing—and I have made inquiry elsewhere—has not been submitted. This is a matter, it seems to me, which should concern the Appropriations Committee and this House, as to whether the appropriations process should be carried through until the statement referred to in Public Law 190 has been submitted. I wonder if any member of the subcommittee would care to comment.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I would say to my friend that I understand appropriate reports are being prepared to be submitted to the Appropriations Committee and other committees involved, principally the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. BINGHAM. I understand that in the other body the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee has shown his concern about this. He has said that he will not take further action on this bill until that statement has been prepared and submitted. I hope the appropriation process will not be completed until that is done.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. As soon as received, the statement will have the immediate attention of our committee. I am advised that the report is in the process of preparation.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I will be very brief. I just take this time to refer to the North Mankato project. I note there is an item in there to take care of it, and I just want to say "thank you" to the committee for taking care of a very necessary project and a very worthwhile one. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations in this title shall be available for expenses of attendance by military personnel at meetings in the manner authorized by 5 U.S.C. 4110, uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902), and for printing, either during a recess or session of Congress, of survey reports authorized by law, and such survey reports as may be printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Congress; and during the current fiscal year the revolving fund, Corps of Engineers, shall be available for purchase (not to exceed two hundred and three, of which one hundred and ninety-seven shall be for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles: *Provided*, That the total capital of said fund shall not exceed \$178,500,000.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VANIK

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VANIK: On page 10, after line 10, insert the following language:

*Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated to the Corps of Engineers shall be used to dump polluted dredged materials into the Great Lakes or their tributaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to prevent dredged material along the ports of the Great Lakes from being dumped into the open waters of Lake Erie and the other Great Lakes. Some years ago we

started out on an effort to get the Corps of Engineers to provide for the establishment of dike areas for the containment of this material. In my particular community, the material is dredged out of a very heavily polluted river and is dumped out into the open waters of Lake Erie, where it continues to dissolve and spread pollution throughout the entire lake. I am sure the same pollution occurs—and I have discussed this problem with my colleagues—at other ports on the Great Lakes, where they have a similar problem.

I feel the only way we can bring an end to this kind of Federal contribution to the pollution of the Great Lakes is to prohibit the Corps of Engineers from dumping this dredged material into the open waters of the lake, upon which so many of us must depend for our fresh water supplies.

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

Mr. VANIK. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, let me tell the gentleman I made inquiry in the Committee on Appropriations respecting the practice of the Corps of Engineers in dumping polluted dredgings into Lake Michigan. We who come from Chicago are very much opposed to the practice, and we protested it, protested it strongly. As a result of the inquiry and the protest we have made, I am now told that with respect to Lake Michigan there will be no dumping of polluted dredgings in the Chicago and Green Bay area.

I can tell the gentleman however that polluted dredgings are still going to be dumped into Lake Michigan, because of the dredging the Corps of Engineers says is necessary, in the following areas: Sturgeon Bay, Kewaunee, Manitowoc, Sheboygan, Milwaukee, Kenosha, St. Joseph, South Haven, and Frankfort. I think this practice must be stopped to protect the waters of the lake.

I am told further that the Committee on Public Works has under consideration a bill providing for sharing costs with the local communities under which there will be a prohibition, of the kind that is contained in the gentleman's amendment, and by the year 1973, this cost study will be completed and incorporated in a bill that will be introduced out of the Committee on Public Works.

I agree with the gentleman this practice of dumping polluted dredgings into the Great Lakes should have been stopped a long time ago. The Great Lakes are our greatest single water resource in this country. I certainly do not want to have Lake Michigan die as did Lake Erie, where, as I understand it, there is a dead spot one mile in diameter. That area is still growing. The practice of the Corps of Engineers should be stopped. The polluted dredgings should not continue to be poured into the Great Lakes. I am told that cannot be stopped at this time, because the harbors will silt up. Thus, we have a choice of evils at the present time.

I think the gentleman from Ohio does a service to the country in calling attention to this evil practice, of dumping pollution into the Great Lakes. I urge

this study by the Committee on Public Works be expedited so that the waters of the Great Lakes can be kept clean for future generations.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman from Illinois. He has done yeoman work in the committee on this. I hope he continues his efforts to see that there is adequate funding on this program.

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

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement which was made by the gentleman from Illinois, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be withdrawn at this time for the reason that the effect will be to close a number of the harbors in this area as there will be a lack of places in which to put the dredgings. Those dredgings are being taken out of some waters to maintain navigation and being put back into somewhat the same waters. I hope it will be stopped, but we cannot completely solve the problem until the pending legislation is passed authorizing the funding of containment areas as part of the Corps operation and maintenance program. I believe the damage which would be caused by the amendment offered by the gentleman would far exceed the adverse effects of the present practice.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended by 2 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would say we fully agree with the action desired by the gentleman from Ohio, but I concur with the statement of the gentleman from Illinois that the amendment would require the closing of harbors with damage far exceeding the benefits.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi advise me whether there are funds in this bill to provide for studies of that problem? Are there funds available that could be used, for example, in the Cleveland Harbor area, which is the principal problem I have here?

Mr. WHITTEN. We have fully funded the pilot study in prior years and the recommended action, involving in-shore dredging is pending authorization. If authorized, I am sure the corps could initiate the program within available funds pending additional appropriations.

Mr. VANIK. Do I understand that after the legislative committee directs its attention to this problem, the gentleman's committee would direct its attention to funding this?

Mr. WHITTEN. After the legislative committee has taken action, that will be one of our first orders of business.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation which will provide \$1 billion in Federal funds for water pollution. This can be added to the \$440 million remaining from last year which was not spent because of the administration's freeze on spending.

I supported the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) to increase the appropriation for the construction of badly needed waste treatment works by an additional \$200 million. I regret that this amendment failed. The Nation will pay for its failure with the continuing flow of millions of gallons of untreated and poorly treated sewage and wastes into our waterways.

Today's bill does represent, however, an increase of \$200 million over last year's appropriation. It is a step in the right direction. It is aid badly needed.

During consideration of this bill, I offered an amendment to prohibit the Corps of Engineers from spending funds to dump polluted dredged material into the Great Lakes and its tributaries. I shall withdraw this amendment after assurances by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, JAMIE WHITTEN, that supplemental appropriations would be made for the construction of diked areas after the legislative committee, the House Public Works Committee, completed necessary prior action.

If the Public Works Committee approves of the administration's request for 50-50 funding in the construction of diked areas, it would provide no solution to the problem. My community does not have the financial sources for this level of contribution. An estimated \$11 million diking program would require \$5.5 million in local funds which is simply not available. The administration's proposal must be amended. The Federal Government must assume the full cost of preventing pollution of public waters through operations conducted by the U.S. Corps of Engineers.

In addition to waste treatment grants, this bill provides \$3.9 million for research on Great Lakes pollution, considerably less than the \$20 million authorized by the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1970. It is my hope that this allocation can be increased in the supplemental appropriation or increased by the other body.

Of allocations for construction of waste treatment works made to the State of Ohio, \$34,103,142 remains uncommitted with only 2 weeks remaining in fiscal 1970. This bill will add \$40,850,000 to the funds available to Ohio for a total of \$74,953,142. Up to the present time, Ohio's applications total \$55,409,000, indicating that \$19,500,000 of the allocation to Ohio may be lost unless the State of Ohio develops a meaningful program.

The Ohio program for pollution provides loans out of a \$100,000,000 bond issue. These loans must be paid back to the State by the local communities. There are no Ohio grants. Therefore, Ohio will receive only 30 to 33 percent Federal matching funds while other

States which make pollution grants will receive 50 to 55 percent Federal grants.

The people of Ohio are being denied a substantial part of their Federal tax dollars because of the arbitrary and short-sighted Ohio program.

My community has approved a \$100 million bond issue to meet the water pollution problem of the Cleveland area. Because of the limitations of the Ohio program, the Cleveland plan is stalled on dead center while the pollution problem is aggravated by the hour.

The prospects are dismal, but I hope we can move toward realistic solutions to the pollution problems of Lake Erie—America's most critical pollution problem.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment I have offered.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will read.

The clerk read as follows:

#### CONSTRUCTION GRANTS FOR WASTE TREATMENT WORK

For grants for construction of waste treatment works pursuant to section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to remain available until expended, \$1,000,000,000; *Provided*, That not to exceed \$200,000,000 of such amount may be available for allocation to States based on eligibility for reimbursement under provisions of section 8(c) of the Act or severe local and basin-wide water pollution problems; *Provided further*, That sums not obligated at the end of the fiscal year from the amounts allocated to each State shall be reallocated in accordance with the provisions in the Act.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL: Page 14, strike out lines 6 and 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$1,250,000,000; *Provided*, That not to exceed \$250,000,000 of such amount shall be available for allocation to States".

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment about which I have been in communication my colleagues in the House. It has the strong support of almost every one of the Governors of the States of the Union affected. Copies of their letters have been inserted in the RECORD from time to time by me. It has the support of every national conservation organization and the League of Women Voters.

It is a proposal which affords this Nation an opportunity to make good on a commitment made when the Congress passed the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966 by unanimous vote. It carries out the authorization by appropriating the full amount allocated under the law, and spends the money that we pledged we would at the time we passed the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend my friends and colleagues on the Appropriations Committee. They have indeed been generous. This proposal which is before us today marks a monumental departure from the level of funding which has ex-

isted at times past. And, it is with some sadness I find myself here in the well of the House calling upon this body to appropriate more than the level which has been recommended by our very fine Appropriations Subcommittee.

While, I recognize that there are problems with the allocations formula, however, my colleagues will recall, there were also such problems, last year. When we went into the same question last year we were told there were difficulties with the formula and that it would be very difficult or impossible—to get the money allocated, to get the money out, and to get the money spent.

The fact of the matter is that we have done a great deal better than most people anticipated in terms of getting the money out, getting it spent, and getting the needed waste treatment plants on the road toward construction.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to my good friend from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Just for a correction. The gentleman will recall that the Department of the Interior let it be known last year it could spend \$600 million. Actually, the amount made available was something closer to a billion dollars.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman means \$800 million plus the carryover.

Mr. RHODES. The gentleman will recall there was a carryover of some \$150 million.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RHODES. The amount of carryover this year is close to \$500 million, so they actually did not spend as much as they said they could.

Mr. DINGELL. I am very glad my friend has raised that question. I wish to acknowledge the point the gentleman makes.

I took the trouble to communicate—and I will insert in the RECORD immediately following this colloquy the communication I shall now refer to—with the Department of Interior by letter, requesting certain information as to carryover and programing.

It should be noted that the bill does a number of things. First, it appropriates a billion dollars. Second, it directs that \$200 million of that be earmarked for paying up the sum of \$800 million that the Federal Government owes the States for advances made by the several States to communities in reliance on the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966.

In response to my query, David Dominick, Commissioner of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, advised me I was correct in my understanding, that their latest estimate showed approximately \$440 million of funds which had been allocated to the various States will remain unobligated as of June 30.

He points out that this is due to a series of causes. First, the very late date at which the money was made available by the Congress; secondly, the fact that the money was released very late by the Bureau of the Budget so that the

Department of the Interior could not begin its allocation process; and, thirdly, he points out that the delay in getting this money spent is due to the practices of the States which, knowing they have 18 months in which to spend the money, usually hold back a goodly portion of their fund requests until the last 6 months. Indeed he points out, and I am not quoting from the letter:

The latter fact, coupled with a tendency on the part of some States to spread funds utilization of over the permitted 18 month period provided by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, will result in considerable activity in the period July 1, 1970 to December 31.

Then he follows up with:

We anticipate that \$290 million of the \$440 million unobligated on June 30 will have been obligated by December 31. This will leave \$150 million unobligated as of that time, which will be subject to reallocation to those States having an immediate need for such funds.

So I say as a matter of fact he points out there is going to be a very limited amount of funds carried over, a very limited amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DINGELL was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. DINGELL. So he points out that there is going to be only a modest carryover.

The Bureau of the Budget in its studies has pointed out some things to us which are, I think, quite important to the matter that is before us. They point out that during the forthcoming fiscal year it is anticipated that they will be able to program, allocate, and spend \$1.130 billion. This is \$130 million more than the Committee on Appropriations has very generously and let me say very, very wisely made available under the legislation that is before us. But if you consider the fact that \$200 million of this is going to be earmarked for repayment of funds already expended and perhaps the Department of the Interior will want to make more of it available in the form of funds to States which have already expended it, they could come up with a situation where we could have much less money available for expenditure by the States making grants of Federal funds under the law here appropriated than would meet the eye.

So I make the point to my colleagues that it appears to me at least quite urgent that we should make the funds available in a sufficient amount. It is very clear from the backlog and carryover and the estimates of construction needs of this Nation that we can spend many times \$1 billion. The fact that we are going to have a little bit of a carryover at the end of this year or have a little bit of a carryover at the end of next year is going to reflect prudence, economic wisdom and a real determination to get on with the business of clean-up. As a matter of fact, if the Department of the Interior wants to spend more money and gets cooperation from the

Bureau of the Budget and gets the money early enough it can pay off the States, which have advanced funds in reliance on our promise of Federal repayment from the \$800 million not so earmarked. We owe the States a debt of about \$800 million for this. Indeed, if Bureau of the Budget anticipations are valid, we may even wind up with less money being appropriated than can actually be expended according to the Bureau of the Budget figures.

So I would urge my colleagues to support this very modest amendment which adds \$250 million to the funds for construction and which increases by \$50 million the amount which is allocated for repayment to the States in the form of funds already expended by them in reliance on anticipated Federal grants.

Mr. Chairman, there are just a couple of other points that ought to be remembered.

We have in the past weeks in this body increased the amounts of money for water and sewers.

In one instance a very striking amount was added for rural projects, new projects, administered by the Department of Agriculture. And, a little bit earlier than that there was about a \$350 million increase in funds available to HUD which were overwhelmingly adopted.

Mr. Chairman, let me point out something else. The law requires—and this is an absolute mandatory provision of Federal statute—no grants under these programs for construction of sewers can be made until and unless there is an appropriate waste treatment plant waiting at the end of that sewer to receive the sewage that is coming into it. So, if this body wants the other appropriation we have already made for the construction of sewers to be meaningful and for that money to be spent, then we must increase the amount the Appropriations Committee has brought in here before this body to spend for grants to States for waste treatment construction. So, it becomes quite clearly necessary that we should expend the maximum amount.

Mr. Chairman, one additional point which I would like to make is the fact that very shortly before this body there is going to be a \$1 billion authorization which will probably be funded in the forthcoming year for grants to States and municipalities for construction of water and sewer projects. If that program goes through again under existing law there is the requirement that there be a waste treatment plant waiting at the end of that newly constructed sewer or there can be no Federal grant. So, again, we have an urgent need to increase the program to a level at which it should be done.

Mr. Chairman, the last point I want to make—and the committee has been very generous—is this: There will, of course, be problems with the formula, but we have found that the problems anticipated with regard to the formula have not been as great as anticipated and I would urge the committee to adopt the amendment.

The letters referred to follow:

JUNE 8, 1970.

HON. DAVID D. DOMINICK,  
Commissioner, Federal Water Quality Administration, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER DOMINICK: I would appreciate being provided with a report concerning the status of funds appropriated for the construction grant program authorized by the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966.

It is my understanding that the latest estimate shows that some \$440 million in funds have been allocated to the various States will remain unobligated as of June 30, 1970. I would appreciate being advised as to whether this estimate is correct. If not, what is the correct amount?

Under the terms of the Act funds allocated during a given fiscal year remain available to the State to which said allocation was made until six months following the end of that fiscal year. Since the increased appropriation for fiscal year 1970 was not made available to the States until several months after the start of the fiscal year, is it not true that some States have found it difficult to make timely obligations of the funds allocated to them? Will not these States in all probability make use of their allocations, in total or in part, during the six months following the end of fiscal year 1970? What is your estimate of the funds which will be unobligated at the end of the six month period following the end of the fiscal year.

Since the House Committee on Appropriations expects to report the public works appropriation bill in the near future, I would appreciate an expedited answer to the questions I have posed.

Thank you for your attention to my request.

With every good wish,  
Sincerely yours,

JOHN D. DINGELL,  
Member of Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
Washington, D.C., June 22, 1970.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: Thank you for your letter of June 8 pertaining to utilization of funds appropriated for grants for construction of waste treatment facilities.

You are correct in your understanding that our latest estimate shows that approximately \$440 million in funds which have been allocated to the various States will remain unobligated as of June 30, 1970. Delays in the processing of grant applications by some States have made it difficult to insure timely obligation of funds for approved projects.

The latter fact, coupled with a tendency on the part of some States to spread fund utilization over the permitted 18 month period provided by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, will result in considerable activity in the period July 1, 1970 to December 31, 1970. We anticipate that \$290 million of the \$440 million unobligated on June 30 will have been obligated by December 31. This will leave \$150 million unobligated as of that time, which will be subject to reallocation to those States having an immediate need for such funds.

If we can be of further assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID D. DOMINICK,  
Commissioner.

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

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

Mr. RHODES. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I emphatically support the amendment to provide full funding of \$1.250 billion to finance the clean waters program.

It seems to surprise many who know my record as one of the most economy-minded Members of Congress, and particularly in my Defense subcommittee where I have fought over the years to cut many billions in needless spending, when I take the floor to ask for more money than the Appropriations Committee proposes. I have often pointed out that billion-dollar spending programs are not the appropriate panacea for every national ill, and I shall always strongly fight the tendency to dip into taxpayers' pockets on the pretext that spending and spending alone can solve critical problems.

In the matter of environmental pollution, however, the solution is implicit in an accelerated spending program which will construct antipollution facilities, which will support intensified research into new means of preserving environmental integrity.

The amendment before us now is a very concrete example of this type of positive, constructive expenditures which will pay lasting dividends. It further has the support of an overwhelming majority of American taxpayers who are justifiably alarmed about the deterioration of our lakes, rivers, and streams.

You may recall that last October 8 when the fiscal 1970 Public Works Appropriation came before the House, I offered the Minshall amendment to increase clean water funds from \$600 million to \$1 billion. While this was rejected by just two votes the impetus of this action carried over to the Senate where \$1 billion was approved.

Conferees settled at an \$800 million compromise, but the victory of achieving a \$200 million increase, in the words of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) in his February 26, 1970, letter to me, "made it possible for a substantial increase in waste treatment plant construction activity."

I agree with him completely that it would be tragic if the momentum we gained should be lost on the floor today. Accordingly, I was pleased to pledge to him early in March my efforts toward achieving full funding of \$1.25 billion in fiscal 1971 construction grants.

In doing so, I take some pride in the fact that my amendment last October was responsible for stepping up fiscal 1970 funds and encouraging support for even greater financial endeavors for fiscal 1971. And, I am proud, too, of the letter I received from colleagues from across the aisle last October 13, just after the debate in the House:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., October 13, 1969.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We wish to thank you for your support of our endeavor for full funding of the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966, to make available \$1 billion for grants to States and municipalities for construction of sewage treatment facilities. Although we did not achieve the full sum, your support helped make possible an appropriation of

some three times the budget request. This is something in which you may take justifiable pride.

During the coming year, we will be seeking other legislative actions to further advance the cause of clean water, and we hope that we may call upon you again for your kind and invaluable assistance.

With warm good wishes,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN P. SAYLOR,  
HENRY S. REUSS,  
JIM WRIGHT,  
JOHN D. DINGELL,  
JOHN A. BLATNIK,  
MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,  
PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, Jr.,  
Members of Congress.

This was a truly bipartisan effort last fall, as it must be again today. I strongly urge adoption of the amendment to provide full funding and trust that a majority of this House is now fully alert to the fact that clean water is a top priority item on the national agenda.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan has made a very persuasive argument and I would like to indicate to him and to the House right now that I take off my hat to no Member in my desire and in my feeling of haste to get the proper waste disposal plants constructed in this Nation. Certainly we all feel that way. If it were possible under the legislative formula under which these funds are allocated to do it faster and to do the job better, then, very likely, we would be appropriating more money because it probably could be used.

Mr. Chairman, there is not any doubt but what the need exists. However, the facts are these, ladies and gentlemen of the House and Mr. Chairman, and they are irrefutable.

Last year we had available for this particular purpose something like \$900 million. We are going to have a carry-over of at least \$440 million. Now, in this bill is \$1 billion in new appropriations. So available for this program next year will be a total of at least \$1,440 million. Now, the gentleman from Michigan himself said that the most that could possibly be spent was \$1,130 million. So, on that basis we are appropriating about \$330 million more than even the gentleman from Michigan thinks we can use.

The facts are that the committee has changed the formula in this particular bill if it remains as it is to provide that of the \$1 billion we would make available, \$800 million would be distributed under the old formula based primarily on population.

Two hundred million dollars would be distributed to the States which have already gone further than the Federal program would finance, and which are entitled to be reimbursed. The gentleman's own State of Michigan will get back about \$19 million in reimbursements under this revision of the formula. We are trying to help the States which have gone ahead and prefunded the Federal share on approved projects.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would advise the gentleman, and I wish to commend the committee, because they have done a

splendid job, and I just want them to do a better job—but to answer the points the gentleman raises, he is correct in what the bill authorizes, and it does authorize a \$200 million reimbursement. That is very good. This actually tends to reduce the amount by about \$350 million less than the Bureau of the Budget has said was necessary. That is why I set my figure at a modest \$250 million so that we would be trying to get closer to the Bureau of the Budget's estimates.

Mr. RHODES. The gentleman from Michigan uses figures which confuse me, as they did in his original presentation. As to the amounts referred to, there is absolutely no way to spend it. In the original legislative bill and it was good legislation, the only amount which would have been authorized this year was \$1.250 billion. We are going to make provision for \$1.44 billion. I am at a loss to know how the gentleman arrives at the fact that this program is merely adequate when it is nearly perfect.

Mr. DINGELL. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman has pointed out to this body that the committee has made available \$800 million for formula allocations, and that \$200 million are reimbursements. The Bureau of the Budget has said that, on the formula basis, this is \$1.3 billion.

Mr. RHODES. Let me correct the gentleman's figures, then. Eight hundred million dollars, plus \$440 million is \$1.24 billion, which is \$110 million more than the Bureau of the Budget says they can spend.

Mr. DINGELL. Even taking those figures—

Mr. RHODES. They are your figures. Mr. DINGELL. Well, taking my figures, and not going into the fact that the Department of the Interior has indicated that only \$150 million will be carried over at the end of the calendar year—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be defeated.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

I would like to state that I appreciate the comments of my friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL). He has been most complimentary to the committee and the subcommittee. And they did work hard trying to carry out the desires that our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, has.

We have used some words rather loosely around here when we talk about expenditures. What we are really talking about here is the allocation of funds. Under the original allocation formula the Bureau of the Budget had to ask for more funds than really necessary in the overall in an effort to meet the needs of a small number of States.

The committee, in trying to meet that problem, has recommended several changes, and our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, has not objected because they are good changes. They are very significant and they are needed.

What we have done is provide \$1.4 billion plus, to carry out the pending grant applications of \$1.5 billion, practically the entire amount of all the so-called pending applications which frequently are only letters of intent. Many involve projects on which the localities have not had the opportunity to complete their proposals, the engineering and design, or have assurances of local matching funds. They represent the desires of those communities, and they probably will be finalized and constructed eventually, but may require many years before funding is necessary.

We have also revised the time period for reallocation of funds not utilized by States from 18 to 12 months. This will help greatly in expediting the availability of additional funds to those States which can evidence current need over and above their allocation under the formula.

Under this committee action, of shortening the time when funds can be reallocated from 18 months to 12 months, some \$210 million more will be available on June 30, 1971, for reallocation than would be available under the existing formula.

In summary, the committee feels that it has provided adequate funds to meet virtually all of the pending applications for new grants; has provided \$200 million to initiate reimbursement of the States which have prefinanced projects; and has shortened the time period for the reallocation of unutilized State funds. In so doing it has really met all of the essential requirements of the program for the coming fiscal year. Certainly we have provided for the States a much better program than would be possible under the gentleman's own amendment under the existing allocation formula.

So I ask you to stand by the committee. We tried to do a good job and I think we have.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, to reemphasize what has been said, last year we provided \$800 million and they have only expended about \$247 million as of June 1. They have \$553.5 million available as of June 1 and this \$553.5 million is available now—plus \$1 billion more in this bill. Only \$54 million was obligated in May.

At least \$1.44 billion will be available in fiscal year 1971 and the agency estimates \$360 million of this will be available for reallocation to any States which have additional needs in excess of their allocation.

So there are ample funds here. There is more than they can use. So this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the well-being of our Nation depends on a continuing commitment to maintain a healthy environment, and water pollution abatement and control must be one of the essential parts of this goal.

The massive problem of water pollution is one that we must act on immediately. Time is not on our side.

One of the worst examples of the

harmful effects of water pollution is Lake Erie, which is becoming a dead lake. Unless we take immediate and drastic action, according to the U.S. Public Health Service, Lake Erie is doomed to total death—that is, a situation where it will be unable to support any form of life whatsoever. Furthermore, and even more threatening, we are warned that this lake, virtually dead now, could be a foreboding of what lies ahead for many more of our Nation's waterways.

The drive to abate and control water pollution has been lagging. This is partly because of insufficient funding from the Federal Government. If we further delay in taking corrective action, we will increase by a large amount the eventual cost of water pollution abatement and control. Furthermore, it will impose an unnecessary and continuing threat to the health and welfare of our Nation and our people.

Four years ago Congress passed the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966. Now it is time to live up to the full commitment made in that act, something we have not done in the past. The Clean Waters Restoration Act authorizes appropriations of \$1.25 billion in fiscal year 1971. It is imperative that we appropriate the full amount—\$1.25 billion.

I urge support of this amendment.

Congress recognized by the Clean Waters Restoration Act that the Federal Government has definite responsibilities for halting water pollution. Let us now act on the commitment we made 4 years ago. Certainly our Nation has the resources to do so.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee, and especially its Public Works Subcommittee, deserves considerable credit for presenting to this House today a bill containing \$1 billion for sewage treatment grants under the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966.

The changes proposed with regard to the allocation of the money—80 percent to the States on the basis of population, 20 percent to retire reimbursable debts owed to States for prefinancing the Federal share of grants, and the reallocation of the money at the end of 12 rather than 18 months—are particularly significant, and will certainly help to maximize the benefits which will be gained from the expenditure of this money.

It is my belief, however, that this House could, with ample justification, appropriate the full \$1.25 billion authorized by the Congress for waste treatment facilities. That is why I support the Dingell amendment.

The committee will tell you that this bill provides for \$1 billion in new appropriations to which can be added a carry-over of \$440 million, for a total of \$1.4 billion. But the need far exceeds that.

At the present time there are applications for sewage treatment grants in FWPCA regional offices totaling about \$0.5 billion. Additional applications for grants totaling \$1.08 billion are in State water pollution agencies, for a total of \$1.5 billion or \$100 million over what the committee is providing.

Furthermore, the best information I can obtain indicates that there may be up to another \$250 million in grant requests now in local agencies which will be eligible for funding by the end of the 1971 fiscal year.

In addition to this are the reimbursables now owed to various States which have prefinanced to Federal share of water treatment projects, on the assumption that they would later be reimbursed by the Federal Government. There is a total of about \$400 million in "earned" reimbursables now owed to the States. The bill proposed by the committee would provide enough funds to repay \$200 million of this, but another \$200 million would not be financed.

The potential need then is not just the \$1.4 billion which is made available through a new appropriation of \$1 billion and a \$440 million carryover. The need is \$1.9 billion—\$1.5 billion in grant requests and \$400 million in reimbursables—plus whatever new local grant requests will become eligible for financing by the end of the fiscal year.

When the Clean Water Restoration Act was passed by the Congress it was a recognition that our waters are not clean, and that major action had to be taken to help provide financial help to State and local units of government to clean up the rivers and streams of this country. Our States were accepting on good faith the fact that this help would be coming from the Federal Government. Many prefinanced the Federal share of local grants so that they could start pollution abatement programs quickly, and in a sense it is these very States which acted most quickly to clean up their waters that may now be left holding the bag unless the Congress fully funds the pollution program before us today.

In my own State of Wisconsin many millions of dollars were prefinanced on the assumption that the Federal Government would eventually come through with its full share for our pollution abatement construction projects, but to quote from a letter from the Governor of our State on this matter:

While we have built a feature into our law which will permit state advances of federal funds, we are extremely hesitant about utilizing this method in the face of a possibility that the reimbursement provisions may be stricken from the federal program.

With the increased realization in recent years that we must act now to clean up our environment, more and more States have adopted water quality standards. With the passage of the Water Quality Improvement Act a few months ago, we even extended the kinds of pollutants—in this case pesticides—which will be considered in setting those standards. The House has added more funds for water and sewer lines in both the HUD and agriculture appropriations bills. But additional funds for water and sewer lines will be of little help unless we have adequate waste treatment plants at the end of those lines.

We have the technology available today to clean up our waters. We must ask ourselves whether we have the will and

the commitment to do so. Just 2 months ago on "Earth Day" many of us set forth goals for cleaning up the environment. But we cannot fool ourselves. It will cost money to achieve these goals. Some of that money would be provided in this legislation. It is time, I think, that the Congress must match its promise with its performance with regard to clean water, or face a widening of the credibility gap between the Federal Government and our State and local governments. It is no longer enough for Government to make a good effort to clean up our waterways. We must make our best effort and we must make it now.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Congressman DINGELL's amendment which would provide full funding for the construction of waste treatment facilities.

The Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 called for a steady rise over 5 years in Federal matching grants to States for sewage treatment facility construction—from \$150 million in fiscal year 1967 to \$450 million in 1968, \$700 million in 1969, \$1 billion in 1970, and \$1.25 billion in 1971.

Only \$567 million was appropriated during the first 3 years. Last year the administration requested \$214 million, but Congress appropriated \$800 million to clean up our Nation's waterways. Of this \$800 million, the administration will have obligated only \$515 million by June 30, 1970.

Can the money be spent wisely? Do the States feel that they can use these funds to clean up their streams, lakes, rivers, and harbors? The answer is yes. As of February 28, 1970, pending applications for construction grants for waste treatment facilities totaled \$1.7 billion. California alone has \$57 million worth of applications that are awaiting approval and funding. Many say that even this amount is unrealistically low.

Mr. Chairman, in order to restore our waterways to a decent condition, we must back up our good intentions, our lofty rhetoric, with cash. Our society is demanding that the streams, lakes, and coastal waters, in addition to serving obvious water supply needs, be fit for recreational uses, such as swimming and boating, and also be pleasing to the sight and smell.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DINGELL), there were—ayes 28, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ASPINALL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under considera-

tion the bill (H.R. 18127) making appropriation for public works for water, pollution control, and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Panama Canal, the Federal Water Quality Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### SUBMISSION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1519, NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

Mr. PERKINS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1519) to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 91-1226)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1519) to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Act".

#### STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby affirms that library and information services adequate to meet the needs of the people of the United States are essential to achieve national goals and to utilize most effectively the Nation's educational resources and that the Federal Government will cooperate with State and local governments and public and private agencies in assuring optimum provision of such services.

## COMMISSION ESTABLISHED

Sec. 3. (a) There is hereby established as an independent agency within the executive branch, a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shall provide the Commission with necessary administrative services (including those related to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) for which payment shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement, from funds of the Commission and such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Commission and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

## CONTRIBUTIONS

Sec. 4. The Commission shall have authority to accept in the name of the United States grants, gifts, or bequests of money for immediate disbursement in furtherance of the functions of the Commission. Such grants, gifts, or bequests, after acceptance by the Commission, shall be paid by the donor or his representative to the Treasurer of the United States whose receipts shall be their acquittance. The Treasurer of the United States shall enter them in a special account to the credit of the Commission for the purposes in each case specified.

## FUNCTIONS

Sec. 5. (a) The Commission shall have the primary responsibility for developing or recommending overall plans for, and advising the appropriate governments and agencies on, the policy set forth in section 2. In carrying out that responsibility, the Commission shall—

(1) advise the President and the Congress on the implementation of national policy by such statements, presentations, and reports as it deems appropriate;

(2) conduct studies, surveys, and analyses of the library and informational needs of the Nation, including the special library and informational needs of rural areas and of economically, socially, or culturally deprived persons, and the means by which these needs may be met through information centers, through the libraries of elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher education, and through public, research, special, and other types of libraries;

(3) appraise the adequacies and deficiencies of current library and information resources and services and evaluate the effectiveness of current library and information science programs;

(4) develop overall plans for meeting national library and informational needs and for the coordination of activities at the Federal, State, and local levels, taking into consideration all of the library and informational resources of the Nation to meet those needs;

(5) be authorized to advise Federal, State, local, and private agencies regarding library and information sciences;

(6) promote research and development activities which will extend and improve the Nation's library and information-handling capability as essential links in the national communications networks;

(7) submit to the President and the Congress (not later than January 31 of each year) a report on its activities during the preceding fiscal year; and

(8) make and publish such additional reports as it deems to be necessary, including, but not limited to, reports of consultants, transcripts of testimony, summary reports, and reports of other Commission findings, studies, and recommendations.

(b) The Commission is authorized to contract with Federal agencies and other public and private agencies to carry out any of its functions under subsection (a) and to

publish and disseminate such reports, findings, studies, and records as it deems appropriate.

(c) The Commission is further authorized to conduct such hearings at such times and places as it deems appropriate for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

(d) The heads of all Federal agencies are, to the extent not prohibited by law, directed to cooperate with the Commission in carrying out the purposes of this Act.

## MEMBERSHIP

Sec. 6. (a) The Commission shall be composed of the Librarian of Congress and fourteen members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Five members of the Commission shall be professional librarians or information specialists, and the remainder shall be persons having special competence or interest in the needs of our society for library and information services, at least one of whom shall be knowledgeable with respect to the technological aspects of library and information services and sciences. One of the members of the Commission shall be designated by the President as Chairman of the Commission. The terms of office of the appointive members of the Commission shall be five years, except that (1) the terms of office of the members first appointed shall commence on the date of enactment of this Act and shall expire two at the end of one year, three at the end of two years, three at the end of three years, three at the end of four years, and three at the end of five years, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, and (2) a member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term.

(b) Members of the Commission who are not in the regular full-time employ of the United States shall, while attending meetings or conferences of the Commission or otherwise engaged in the business of the Commission, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Chairman, but not exceeding the rate specified at the time of such service for grade GS-18 in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, including traveltime, and while so serving on the business of the Commission away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons employed intermittently in the Government service.

(c) (1) The Commission is authorized to appoint, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, covering appointments in the competitive service, such professional and technical personnel as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its function under this Act.

(2) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service or classification laws, temporary and intermittent services of such personnel as is necessary to the extent authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed the rate specified at the time of such service for grade GS-18 in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, including traveltime, and while so serving on the business of the Commission away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons employed intermittently in the Government service.

## AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and \$750,000 for the fiscal

year ending June 30, 1971, and for each succeeding fiscal year, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

And the House agree to the same.

CARL D. PERKINS,  
JOHN BRADEMANS,  
PATSY MINK,  
OGDEN REID,  
WILLIAM A. STEIGER,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

CLAIBORNE PELL,  
RALPH YARBOROUGH,  
JENNINGS RANDOLPHE,  
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,  
EDWARD M. KENNEDY,  
WALTER F. MONDALE,  
THOMAS F. EAGLETON,  
WINSTON L. PROUTY,  
JACOB JAVITS,  
PETER H. DOMINICK,  
GEORGE MURPHY,  
RICHARD SCHWEIKER,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

## STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill, S. 1519, to Establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommend the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a new text. The House recedes from its disagreement to the Senate bill with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment.

Except for minor clarifying, conforming provisions this statement explains the action of the managers on the part of the House.

The Senate bill established the Commission within the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, while the House amendment established the Commission as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government. The conference report adopts the provisions of the House amendment.

The two versions of the bill differed with respect to the administrative provisions for the Commission. The conference report adopts the provisions of the House amendment.

The Senate bill authorized the Commission to accept contributions of money and immediately disburse same for the purposes of the Commission. The House amendment did not contain these provisions. The conference report adopts these Senate provisions.

The Senate bill provided that the Commission shall have responsibility for developing or recommending plans for the National policy, while the House amendment limits the function to developing plans. The conference report adopts the provision of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill explicitly included language relating to special library and informational needs of rural areas, while the House amendment did not. The conference report adopts the provision of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill required an appraisal of resources and services, while the House amendment confined the appraisal to resources. The conference report adopts the Senate provision.

The House amendment stated that the Commission shall appraise "deficiencies" of library and information resources, as well as their "adequacies", while the Senate bill did not. The conference report adopts the House provision.

The Senate bill required that the Commission advise Federal, State and local agencies regarding libraries and information sciences. The House amendment contained no comparable provision. The conference report contains the provision of the Senate bill but modifies it to authorize, but not to require the Commission to furnish such advice.

The Senate bill required reporting through the Secretary to the President and Congress. The House required reporting directly to the President and Congress. The conference report adopts the provision of the House amendment.

The Senate bill set January 31 as the reporting date, while the House amendment specified January 1. The conference report contains the provisions of the Senate bill.

The House amendment authorized reports in addition to the annual report, while the Senate bill did not. The Conference report adopts the provision of the House amendment.

Section 6 of the Senate bill and Section 6 of the House amendment specified the composition and membership of the Commission. They differed in a number of respects and substantively in the following particulars:

(1) Both bills provided for a fifteen member Commission. The Senate bill specified that the Librarian of Congress be a statutory member of the Commission while the House amendment did not.

(2) The Senate bill provided that at least five members of the Commission be professional librarians or information scientists while the House amendment set five as the maximum number of such professionals.

(3) The Senate bill but not the House amendment required that at least one member of the Commission be knowledgeable with respect to the technological aspects of library services.

The conference report rewrites Section 6 with the resolution of these differences as follows:

(1) The conference report provides for a fifteen member Commission and specifies that the Librarian of Congress be one of the members of the Commission with the other members of the Commission being appointed by the President with two to serve initially for one year, three to serve initially for two years, three to serve initially for four years and three to serve initially for five years. After the expiration of such terms the conference report provides that the terms of office of the members of the Commission shall be five years.

(2) The conference report provides that only five members of the Commission shall be professional librarians or information scientists and the remainder shall be persons having a special competence or interest in the needs of our society for library and information services. The conference substitute requires that at least one member of the Commission be knowledgeable with respect to the technological aspects of library services.

The Senate bill increased the authorization to \$750,000 in fiscal year 1971, while the House amendment maintained the authorization at \$500,000. Both the Senate bill and the House amendment authorized an appropriation of \$500,000 for fiscal year 1970. The Senate limited the appropriation in the following fiscal years to \$750,000 each year. The House amendment placed no ceiling on appropriations for fiscal years after fiscal year 1970. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate bill.

CARL PERKINS,  
JOHN BRADEMANS,  
PATSY MINK,  
OGDEN REID,  
WILLIAM A. STEIGER,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

COL. ROSCOE TURNER: R.I.P.

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

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker—

O I have skipped the surly bonds of earth,  
And danced the skies on laughter-silvered wings.

Son of a Mississippi farmer, who was opposed to young Roscoe's desire to be a railroad engineer because it was "too dangerous," he was in the front rank of that wild and wonderful breed of men whose glamorous and hazardous exploits in aviation between the two World Wars thrilled and astounded the world.

Sunwards I've climbed, and joined the tumbling mirth  
Of sun-split clouds, and done a hundred things  
You have not dreamed of! Wheeled and soared and swung,  
High in the sunlit silence; hovering there,  
I've chased the shouting wind along, and flung  
My eager craft through footless halls of air.

Intrigued by the sight of some training planes, sent by the Federal Government to the old Memphis Driving Park, he tried to join up—but the Army was not interested. One month after the United States entered World War I, Roscoe Turner was in uniform: in the Ambulance Corps. But he wound up in the balloon service, as an observer, and in 1919 was discharged as a first lieutenant.

Up, up the long, delirious burning blue  
I've trod the wind-swept heights with easy grace,  
Where never lark, nor even eagle, flew. . . .

A lion tamer immediately after World War I, he switched to parachute jumping with an air circus, and became a qualified pilot and stunt flyer. Few in his era were to fly faster than he did—in 1930 he set an east-west transcontinental record of 18 hours, 43 minutes, a truly astonishing feat for the day—and was on his way to becoming one of the leading heroes in the sport of setting air records, until the advent of World War II in 1939 stilled forever the roaring, snarling sounds of tiny Wasp-Senior and Wedell-Williams racing planes hurling around the pylons at over 300 miles an hour.

Seven times he broke transcontinental speed records; three times he won the Thompson Trophy prize for the annual 300-mile race; three times, the Harmon Trophy, given to the country's top speed pilot, and also took the Bendix cross-country race plus any other number of top prizes. It was an age of color and splendor; the American people wanted their heroes to be glamorous and outstanding, and Roscoe Turner gave his public what they sought. It was not unusual to see him striding down the street, dazzling in a blue tunic with gold braid, parachute slung over his shoulder, and his pet lion, "Gilmore," on a leash, or in his favorite uniform: blue tunic, fawn-colored breeches, knee-length boots, Sam Brown belt and crimson flying helmet. An individual in an age of individualists, the famous cartoon character "Smilin' Jack" was based on the image Turner

presented. And through the 1930's, uncounted thousands of spellbound boys huddled over their radios, listening in quivering excitement to the dramatized adventures of Col. Roscoe Turner and his air aces.

Capt. Eddle Rickenbacker said in 1938 that Roscoe Turner had done more for aviation than any man in the United States. During World War II he helped train over 3,500 cadets and instructors for the Army Air Forces. Up until 3 years ago, he continued to fly, piloting the latest military jet planes. In 1952 the Air Force awarded him the Distinguished Flying Cross in recognition of his racing exploits and wartime training service.

A friend remembers Roscoe Turner once saying "When I get so old I cannot come over here and look over the field and hear the engines, I want to die." There is something particularly sad; there is an unusual sense of loss; there is a larger void than otherwise—when a man like Roscoe Turner passes from amongst his fellow men. Those of us privileged to know him, and to call him "Friend," will always carry in our hearts and cherish the memory of this man, one of the last of his kind.

And while, with silent, uplifted mind, I've trod  
That high, untrampled sanctity of space  
Put out my hand, and touched the face of God.

His kind seldom comes among us and, thank God, there is something in the soul of this country, and, indeed, of men everywhere, that thrills to their presence when they do. He is gone, and something has passed with him that will never come again. "Clear," and "Contact," have sounded for him for the last time; the chocks have been pulled away from the wheels, and he has departed on that great eternal flight. Those who knew him will always like to think that somewhere in the vast universe Col. Roscoe Turner's spirit is still at the controls, but his race course is the cosmos, and the pylons marking the turns are the planets, and the stars.

When my life on earth is ended, and my work at last is done,  
I'll set down my wings forever, on the Air-drome of the Sun.  
Where that Greater One keeps vigil, our CO,  
our Flying Boss,  
He whose wingspread fills the Heavens;  
from Polar to the Cross.

Godspeed, Roscoe. Clear the throttle, and open sky.

#### THE 18-YEAR-OLD VOTING BILL

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

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I read in the Fort Myers News Press, a fine editorial which expresses very well some of the same criticisms I have had to giving the vote to 18-year-olds through a simple act of Congress rather than through a constitutional amendment.

As the editor says, the bill, which is now Public Law 285, is a mockery of the

other voting rights amendments to the Constitution, and of the Florida Constitution and Legislature because there is a similar amendment coming up for vote this fall in our State. In effect, Congress has now deprived not only Florida but all States from allowing its voters to have a say so in the matter of the 18-year-old vote.

From still another standpoint, I feel that the new law is a mockery. To me it is misleading to our 18- to 20-year-olds, who will now believe they are being given the great privilege of adult citizenship, when, in my opinion, it makes them second class citizens in some respects. That is, it does not confer upon them all the privileges and responsibilities of true adulthood, such as the right to own property, to be treated as an adult before the courts of the land, to sue and to be sued, to marry without parental consent, to serve on juries, to be responsible for their own debts, to be eligible to hold public office, and to be served alcoholic beverages in a cocktail lounge.

There is no disputing that many young people at 18 years old are mature enough and have sufficient experience to vote and perform the full responsibilities of citizenship. But because the years between 18 to 21 are some of the most formative years of anyone's life, some in this age group will not be prepared to accept the responsibility of adulthood, including the right to vote in all elections.

I therefore think it even more urgent that the people of this country be allowed to grant the right to vote to 18- to 20-year-olds because it is they who know best the abilities of our young people and it is they who must live with whatever the ultimate decision is to be.

The Fort Myers News-Press editorial, "The 18-Year Voting Bill a Mockery," is worthy of careful reading. It follows:

#### THE 18-YEAR VOTING BILL A MOCKERY

By its action to give the vote to 18-year-olds by means of a bill instead of a constitutional amendment, Congress makes a mockery of the three voting rights amendments previously written into the U.S. Constitution. These are the 15th Amendment which abolished race as a voting qualification in 1870, the 19th Amendment which granted suffrage to women in 1920, and the 24th Amendment which abolished the poll tax in 1964. What point is there now to these amendments and to the long controversies which attended their ratification by the states if Congress can do what these amendments did simply by passing a bill?

Congress also makes a mockery of the Florida Constitution and Legislature. Our state constitution sets the voting age at 21. The Legislature has approved an amendment to be voted on by the people in November to reduce the age to 18. But Congress has deprived the Florida voters of their voice in the matter. If they approve the state amendment, their action will be superfluous for Congress will have settled the matter itself. But what is worse, if the people reject this amendment and show by their votes that they do not favor lowering the voting age to 18 in this state, they will find their wishes flouted and their decision overridden by Congress.

President Nixon has declared himself in favor of lowering the voting age to 18 but by constitutional amendment and not by statute. If he has the courage of his conviction he will veto this bill. But the 18-year-

old voting provision is a rider tacked onto a bill extending the 1965 voting rights act. This act, enforcing the voting rights of minorities, will expire this year if not continued. So the word from Washington is that Nixon may sign the bill or let it become law without his signature.

Provision is being made for a Supreme Court test of the measure if it becomes law but the legal groundwork already has been laid by which the court could uphold it. The 1965 voting rights act, like the current extension, contained a provision outlawing literacy tests for voters. New York State had a law that required voters to be able to read and write English which was overridden by the federal act. The Supreme Court upheld the right of Congress to override this state voting requirement by the voting rights act, holding that it was appropriate legislation for Congress to pass under the "equal rights" clause of the Constitution. Since the Supreme Court has said that Congress can pass a bill that supersedes state literacy qualifications for voting, it probably will say that Congress also can pass a bill that supersedes state age requirements for voting.

Actually the lowering of the voting age to 18 is not going to make much difference in any election results, for the boys and girls of 18, 19 and 20 are only a small fraction of the population. In Florida by the 1960 census they numbered 182,587 out of 4,951,560, and in Lee County 1,643 out of 54,539. But the issue raised by this bill, which would override the constitutional authority of the states to set the qualifications for their voters, is crucially important. The issue is whether the U.S. Constitution has in fact become the "scrap of paper" that many of those in Washington today seem to consider it.

#### "DAY OF BREAD" AND "HARVEST FESTIVAL" WEEK

(Mrs. MAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PURCELL), the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WINN), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI), the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. BERRY), the gentleman from New York (Mr. McKNEALLY), the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS), the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK), the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SEBELIUS), the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. CAMP), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL), the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY), and a number of my colleagues in the House in introducing today a resolution calling upon the President to designate Tuesday, October 6 of this year as a "Day of Bread" and the week within which it falls as a "Harvest Festival" week. The resolution also asks the President to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to join with other nations of the world in international observance of this event.

In marking a Day of Bread, we of the United States will join the peoples of

Europe, South America, Asia, and Africa in a common bond of mutual recognition—acknowledging that our existence depends on the bounty of nature, and on forces and circumstances beyond our human control, even in this space age of advanced technology.

In this time of internal strife and international conflict, especially, the Day of Bread gives us a superb opportunity to clasp hands with all peoples everywhere in an expression of gratitude that transcends all boundaries of country, creed, race, or politics.

Last year, the Governors of more than 35 of our States, and the mayor of a number of cities followed the White House in their own proclamations of the Day of Bread, recognizing that bread, which has served the family of man for more than 3,000 years, has come to stand for all food, and for the values expressed in the universal prayer, "Give us this day."

Millions of people worldwide suffer from malnutrition and hunger, and observance of a "Day of Bread" reminds us that we must not relax our efforts to deal with these serious problems both nationally and internationally.

Insofar as bread itself is concerned, millers and bakers with the backing and support of wheat growers, nutrition authorities and consumer groups, have recently taken steps to strengthen the staff of life. It has been reported that perhaps as many as half of all American women of child-bearing years suffer from simple iron-deficiency anemia, along with millions of young children. In consequence, a baker-miller petition has been filed asking approval of the Food and Drug Administration to increase the amount of iron in enriched bread products by three to four times.

Still further, I am advised that those same industries associated with wheat-based consumer products have asked the support of the Food and Nutrition Board, National Research Council, and National Academy of Sciences to increase the thiamine and niacin levels of enriched breads by 50 percent. Thus, as we continue to press our war against malnutrition and hunger, bread assumes even greater importance in our arsenal of foodstuffs.

But, in the larger dimension, bread still stands as the embodiment of our total abundance and our gratitude for what we and all peoples of the world possess. Let us join together on October 6 in gratitude for the bounty of nature and the annual harvest of farm and field, in observance of a "Day of Bread" and a "Harvest Festival" week. I urge all my colleagues to support prompt consideration and enactment of this resolution.

#### STATEMENT CONCERNING BILL INTRODUCED TO DEAL WITH A SUBCHAPTER S PROBLEM

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill relating to

the tax provisions applicable to small business corporations—so-called “subchapter S corporations”—which are taxed in a manner roughly similar to partnerships. When these provisions were first enacted in 1958, Congress determined to make them applicable to operating businesses and not to businesses which received significant amounts of passive investment income—such as royalties, rents, dividends, interest, annuities, and gain from sales or exchanges of stock or securities. Consequently, under the statute a corporation is disqualified from subchapter S treatment if it derives more than 20 percent of its gross receipts from passive investment income sources.

In the mid 1960's, a joint study was undertaken by the Treasury Department and the Committee on Partnerships of the American Bar Association Section on Taxation to review the subchapter S provisions. The staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation also worked with these two groups on this project. This study resulted in a legislative proposal, contained in the Treasury Department's tax reform proposals (both the 1968 and the 1969 recommendations), to revise subchapter S to deal with inadvertent terminations of elections to be taxed under subchapter S, to simplify the law, and generally to make the tax treatment accorded these corporations more nearly like partnership tax treatment. One of the more important changes which this study suggested was the elimination of the passive investment income limitation. However, there has not been an opportunity for the Committee on Ways and Means to give the extensive consideration to this detailed set of proposals which they require.

The trouble presented by the passive income limitation is illustrated by a decision of the United States Tax Court about a year ago holding that “passive investment income” for purposes of the subchapter S passive investment income limitation includes not only gains from actual sales of securities but also any taxable capital gains received by a corporation in the liquidation of another corporation. This may occur even though the business operation was clearly active as is evidenced by the ownership by the corporation involved of more than 50 percent of the other corporation's stock.

If such a gain brings the corporation's passive investment income over the 20-percent limitation, this will disqualify the company for subchapter S treatment—even though the company was basically an operating business—merely because of the liquidation of another active corporation in which it owned a controlling interest. This is true even though the controlling interest itself indicates that insofar as the continuing corporation is concerned, its interest in the liquidated corporation was active in nature, and did not represent a portfolio investment, under the small business corporation provisions.

The bill I am introducing deals with the type of situation I have outlined to you. It provides that, for purposes of

applying the passive investment income test, a capital gain occurring upon the liquidation of a corporation is not to be considered as passive income for subchapter S purposes if the corporation receiving it has more than a 50-percent interest in the liquidated corporation. It should be noted that there is no change in how this gain will be taken into account for other tax purposes. For example, it will continue to be a taxable gain to the shareholders of the subchapter S corporation. It seems to me that it is important to deal with inequities of this type with dispatch, and not await the longer period necessary for the complete overhaul of subchapter S.

#### LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR REGULATION OF COMMERCE IN TEXTILES AND LEATHER FOOTWEAR

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, today I join Chairman WILBUR MILLS and more than 250 other colleagues in sponsoring legislation that provides for the regulation of commerce in textiles and leather footwear.

My purpose is clear: to foster the maintenance and expansion of economically strong textile and footwear industries in the United States and to avoid the disruption of markets for textile and leather footwear articles.

Early last week I wrote to Chairman MILLS about three issues of major concern to the people of my district—shoes, mink pelts, and dairy products. In that letter I said:

I think the degree of import injury shows clearly in the New England shoe firm and shoe worker investigations just completed by the Tariff Commission.

Even though the test of import injury under existing law is quite stringent, three members of the Commission felt in both cases that the test had been met. Since three members disagreed, the Commission has reported to the President that in both cases it “makes no affirmative finding”—surely a disappointing outcome for the petitioning shoe firm and shoe workers.

The tie vote frustrates them under law, but it should persuade the President and the Congress that their economic suffering is sufficient under any realistic standard to warrant assistance. The only question is who will provide it.

I have tried to give the administration as much elbowroom as possible on this question, but an incident of the last few days convinces me that the administration is not likely to provide the needed assistance. I refer, of course, to the abrupt and disheartening dismissal of Assistant Commerce Secretary Kenneth N. Davis, Jr.

Mr. Davis' ouster came shortly after he publicly declared that high-ranking White House staff members were misleading President Nixon on the imports question and were trying to undercut efforts to obtain reasonable controls.

Mr. Speaker, when I wrote to the chairman of the Ways and Means Com-

mittee, I was still disposed to give this administration the benefit of the doubt—to believe that it was actively seeking a reasonable solution to the very serious import situation.

However, the firing of Secretary Davis leaves that open to serious question. If the administration has doubts about the textile problem, it surely can have none about the footwear problem.

Given that fact, the Congress regretfully appears to have no alternative but congressional action. I, therefore, introduce the Mills bill and add my support to that of the majority of Members of the House who ask for action now.

#### HENDERSON PROMISES ACTION TO TERMINATE SUBSIDY TO READER'S DIGEST

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

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on May 7 I requested Reader's Digest to print a rebuttal I prepared to an article in its May issue entitled, “Time to Say No to Big Farm Subsidies.” My request has been denied. I have been informed by Walter B. Mahoney, Jr., managing editor of Reader's Digest, that my article does not “advance the cause of clarification of confusion over the agricultural-subsidy problem.”

Mr. Mahoney's letter hardly serves to clarify the wider issue of Government subsidy policy—especially as it relates to second class mail patrons. He cites his publication's position on the issue—outlined in writing recently to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service—that “we do not want a subsidy, nor do we believe we are being subsidized.”

Certainly there must be some confusion. As of June 5, 1969, the Post Office Department calculated this publication's total annual subsidy at \$9.4 million, and that of all the so-called commercial magazines at more than \$431 million.

Yet, Mr. Mahoney denies that the Reader's Digest is receiving a subsidy. He disputes point-blank the figure given by the Post Office Department, maintains that the Digest receives no subsidy at all and suggests that the Department has made a \$9.4 million mistake.

I am taking the Reader's Digest at its word: I trust that the commendable position it has taken is not mere window-dressing. In any event, I am pleased to initiate action to prevent further confusion.

The Postal Reform Act which the House passed last week and which hopefully will clear the Senate in the near future creates a new rate commission which will establish postal rates under the new organization. It is my intention as soon as the members of that body are appointed, to send to each of them a copy of the letter which I received from Reader's Digest and urge them to cooperate fully in helping to get their desire not to be subsidized fulfilled as quickly as possible.

If, for any reason, the postal reform bill does not pass with its provisions for establishing an independent rate commission, I shall make every effort in the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee to insure that this request is granted. Either Reader's Digest or the Post Office Department is way off base when one says the magazine is getting a \$9.4 million subsidy and the other contends that it is getting no subsidy at all. No doubt the new rate commission, by taking Reader's Digest at its word, can act promptly to resolve this question and insure that the taxpayers are not paying any part of the cost of delivering this magazine.

#### REPRESENTATIVE SPRINGER INTRODUCES NEW HILL-BURTON BILL

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in addressing the House at this time is to announce that I am today introducing a bill which in all respects is like the Hill-Burton bill—H.R. 11102—approved in a conference report by the House on June 10, 1970, except that title VI, section 601 is eliminated. The eliminated section makes it mandatory that the administration spend any and all funds which may be appropriated under this legislation. This same section is principally responsible for the Presidential veto of the measure. It does in fact place an unacceptable and illegal restriction upon the prerogatives of the executive branch in the management of its overall programs. Your conferees pointed this out and tried to eliminate the offending language in conference. We were not successful. Furthermore, at the time the conference report was before this body, I pointed out the dangerous and undesirable precedent being set by including such a provision but also pointed out that it had been the price of a bill.

After 5 weeks of difficult negotiations and with more than a year having passed since the House had considered and passed its version of the Hill-Burton program, it seemed necessary to accept in part the restrictions insisted upon by the Senate. I do not blame the President for refusing to accept this illegal legislation. On the contrary, I strongly support his action in this regard.

The veto message does go on to cite other deficiencies in the conference bill, principally the level of money authorizations. I know they are high, considerably higher than either proposed or passed by this body. It must be said, however, that in conference your managers did succeed in trimming over \$1 billion from the levels approved by the other body. This raised the total authorizations from the \$800 million level accepted here originally to a total of \$1.24 billion. It is evident from the contents of the veto message that the House was close on target as to what can sensibly be used in the next 3 years. We thought so at the time and still think so. The differences as to funding levels, however, are not crucial.

Although they may make it somewhat more difficult for the executive, they do not in fact limit its managerial options and therefore can be handled. For these reasons I have not proposed in my new bill that we try to readjust the authorizations from those so tortuously hammered out in conference. Instead I have confined the changes from the bill approved here in the conference report to the one irreconcilable difference.

By making only this one change in the bill I think the House could take a successful stand both against the pressures of the other body and the wishes of the executive to have other money and program adjustments. It would be an entirely responsible action for the House, one which would reaffirm our conviction that the program we have devised is sound and at the same time, recognize and eliminate a dangerous program which would have been properly challenged by any incumbent of the White House.

I hope that my colleagues on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the whole House will recognize the logic of the veto in this case and sustain it. At the same time, and in the interests of maintaining and improving the Hill-Burton program, I am sure we can act quickly to pass the bill which I am introducing here today. The action on this vital program has been bipartisan through the years and so it should be at this important point in its history.

#### WILLIAM KUNSTLER, AN OUTLAW HIMSELF

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I use the term loosely when I refer to William Kunstler as the defense attorney for the Chicago 7 defendants and, more recently, H. Rap Brown.

Kunstler is presently on the speech circuit pumping out his own self-styled brand of seditious propaganda and characterizing the revolutionaries he has chosen to represent—he only defends those whom he loves—as the modern-day American colonists. He feels these violence-oriented agitators are wrongly considered outlaws by the system, presumably based on his own notions of how the system should operate and the kind of justice that should be meted out to those who deliberately denounce any rule of law.

This mouse of a man, a giant among the militants and activists who have thumbed their noses at the system—and are so far getting away with it—takes exception to legislation which the gentleman from Indiana, Hon. ROSS E. ADAIR, introduced and which I am proudly co-sponsoring that seeks to deal with the likes of Kunstler and anyone else who has the notion that if enough havoc can be created in the courtroom the wheels of justice will come grinding to a halt. It follows—in their minds, at least—that the accused should go scot-free for want of a fair trial or any trial at all. To be

sure, such conduct will be legitimized if the blatant misconduct of the Chicago 7 defendants and their counsel, including Kunstler, with respect to the trial proceedings goes unpunished.

Kunstler, himself out on bond awaiting appeal of the contempt sentences imposed by the Chicago 7 trial judge, arrogantly charges the misuse of the constitutional system, and I would agree that Kunstler has misused the constitutional guarantees in the courtroom as a crutch to justify misconduct and in his speech-making as a foundation to incite revolution, by violence or otherwise, with apparent impunity. He is a disgrace to his profession and the only thing wrong with the system is that it does not bar him from the practice of the law of which he obviously has a distorted view and for which he has so little respect.

#### JAPANESE MISSION FAILS—MILLS BILL ON LEATHER FOOTWEAR AND TEXTILES SHOULD BE PASSED

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it is now crystal clear that the Japanese mission to Washington this week was an effort to delay and undermine the Mills bill. In the Japan Times, Friday, June 5, it was reported that Trade Minister Miyazawa was going to visit Washington and that his visit "is held crucial to whether Miyazawa will succeed in blocking passage of the Mills bill, the central objective of his visit."

Mr. Speaker, I commend Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans for rejecting the ridiculous and incredible textile import proposals advanced by the Japanese delegation. The Japanese proposal now clearly indicates that the Japanese came to Washington to delay action on the Mills bill. Their Washington visit this week is now revealed as a continuation of their tactics of delay and procrastination so obvious since early last year. In the effort to protect our textile industry since the first Japanese voluntary agreement in 1957, we have had no one at the negotiating table who has manifested more determination and courage than Secretary Stans, nor have we had one more thoroughly knowledgeable of the import situation.

It is my understanding that the Japanese delegation proposed a 1-year agreement, and Secretary Stans proposed 5 years. Mr. Stans was willing to negotiate the 5 years, but the Japanese were not willing to go beyond 1 year. Mr. Stans rejected a further Japanese proposal that the last 12 months become the base for her exports of textiles into the United States. This, of course, Mr. Stans rejected, as this unbelievable proposal would include the rise in textile imports into the United States while the issue was actually being negotiated. No proposal by the Japanese to cover footwear was advanced at all.

Mr. Speaker, it is now clear that this latest Japanese visit was only designed to undermine and delay the passage of

the Mills bill, which is imminent. Mr. Speaker, we must proceed with passage of the Mills bill. We can tolerate no further delay. The Mills bill is a liberal trade bill and is in the interest of fair trade and would promote more trade between the United States and Japan.

We have 253 Members of this House who have introduced the Mills bill. Let us reject any further delaying tactics and pass this bill.

#### CONGRESS AND THE TIME OF TRUTH FOR HOUSING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CABELL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the question of whether the Government of this Nation will take effective steps to meet the Nation's housing crisis will be largely decided tomorrow when the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970—H.R. 17495—reaches the House floor.

The membership of the House will be asked to meet the housing crisis in the only way it can be met, by providing a large additional source of mortgage funds at reasonable rates; specifically a minimum of \$4 billion a year to finance mortgage loans for a minimum of 200,000 low-, moderate-, and middle-income families a year, at interest rates no higher than 6½ percent.

Whether this volume of funds will be provided to help the two-thirds of the Nation's population that has been priced out of the housing market will be decided by the fate of title V of the Emergency Home Finance Act.

#### A NATIONAL BANK FOR HOUSING

Title V, the only section that gives meaning to the title of the bill, authorizes the establishment of a National Development Bank for Housing.

Most of the loan funds for the Bank would be obtained through the sale of Development Bank obligations in the open market. Other sources of loan funds could be congressional appropriations, the sale of Bank obligations to the Treasury and on the open market and, when necessary to achieve adequate levels, the required purchase of Bank obligations by tax-exempt private pension funds and virtually tax-exempt foundations.

Bank obligations would have yields equal to comparable Treasury securities, be fully negotiable and fully and unconditionally guaranteed. In other words, they could be purchased without risk or sacrifice by anyone.

#### NONINFLATIONARY

Mr. Speaker, the structure of the Development Bank makes it possible to provide most if not all its loan funds without adding to inflationary pressure. Bank obligations purchased in the open market and by pension funds and foundations would be done with money that would be invested anyway—but in areas of the economy that have far less priority than housing for low-, moderate-, and middle-income families.

Moreover, the Development Bank need not rely on congressional appropriations

or the Bureau of the Budget. Not 1 tax dollar would have to go into Bank loan funds.

Despite all the obvious advantages of such a plan to meet the Nation's housing crisis, the administration, for reasons which I shall never understand, has seen fit to launch strong opposition to title V and the Development Bank for housing that it would create.

Largely because of opposition from the administration and large commercial banks, the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970 was amended during full committee mark up sessions to delete title V. The Rules of the House require that such action be approved by the membership when the bill reaches the floor. I intend to fight such approval and to call for rejection of the committee amendment and restoration of title V and the National Development Bank for housing which it creates.

#### RAILROADS VERSUS HOUSING

It should be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that opposition from the administration and from the country's big banks was being felt at the very time that the administration and these same banks were trying to arrange an allocation of credit in the amount of \$200 million to bail out the Penn Central Railroad after it had been mismanaged into bankruptcy by the Nation's sixth largest conglomerate corporation. Penn Central's indebtedness to the big banks and the fate of well-healed stockholders seems to have priority over all other domestic needs in the administration's view of things.

#### ONLY 46 PERCENT OF THE NEED

Mr. Speaker, the Nation's housing crisis and the tight-money high-interest conditions that have largely produced it, means that the level of housing starts has dropped to an annual rate of 1.2 million units, only 46 percent of the volume needed to meet our yearly housing goals.

It means that the capacity of the assisted housing programs established in the historic 1968 Housing Act have been reduced 40 percent.

It means that families above the assisted housing level now have to have gross incomes of at least \$13,000 to \$15,000 a year in order to afford a \$20,000, 30-year mortgage.

It means that the rate of unemployment in the construction industry has soared to 12 percent, more than double the national unemployment rate.

It means that the housing industry is approaching the point of collapse.

#### DEVELOPMENT BANK POTENTIAL

Mr. Speaker, I would like to place the potential of the Development Bank for housing against this tragic picture. The Development Bank, as I said, would provide a minimum of \$4 billion a year for low-, moderate- and middle-income housing at interest rates not exceeding 6½ percent. But the economic impact on housing and those businesses and industries closely related to housing is twice that amount, \$8 billion, when the multiplier effect of the Bank is considered.

Every \$1,000 invested in residential construction means 90 man-hours of labor.

Two hundred thousand housing units means 190,000 on-site construction jobs and 254,000 off-site jobs.

Taken together these totals amount to half of the nearly 1 million people who have become unemployed in the Nation since the first of the year.

Rejection of title V means that Congress is slamming the door of employment opportunity in the face of a half million people. This Congress, for economic, political, moral, or any other reason, cannot afford to do this to the people of the Nation.

#### SOLID UNION SUPPORT

In this connection, I wish to point out that the AFL-CIO is solidly supporting establishment of a National Development Bank for Housing through title V of the bill. The leadership of 13.5 million workers in the country has repeatedly indicated to the Congress that it has absolutely no reservations about the purchase of Development Bank obligations by the private pension funds which cover their workers.

Furthermore, the AFL-CIO considers the vote on title V to be the key housing vote of the year.

#### NO COMPETITION FOR BANKS

Mr. Speaker, I would estimate that virtually every Member of this House has been contacted one way or another by bank lobbyists opposing title V. I want to assure all House Members that the National Development Bank for Housing created by the title would in no way compete for borrowers with conventional lending institutions. Development Bank loans would be available only to those credit-worthy people who are unable to obtain mortgage funds because of tight money conditions or because they cannot afford what little mortgage money is available because of utterly unreasonable interest rates.

Development Bank loans would go only to those people who could not borrow from conventional lending institutions.

#### CENTERS OF THE HOUSING CRISIS

The Nation's housing crisis is felt most severely in the inner cities and in rural areas. It is concentrated there largely because of the unwillingness of large urban lending institutions to make residential loans to people who almost literally live in the backyard of the banks, and because of the unwillingness and often the inability of country banks to give mortgage loans preference over shorter term, higher yielding credit needs of the people in areas that they serve.

The National Development Bank for housing is designed specifically to help fill this enormous gap in the availability of housing credit.

This is true not only for moderate- and middle-income housing, but for people who would otherwise qualify for federally assisted housing programs but who cannot obtain loans because interest rate subsidy funds have been exhausted or because lending institutions are unwilling to utilize these programs.

It should be stressed that the Development Bank will have the capacity to operate at a minimum loan level of \$4 billion a year regardless of the competition

for Federal budget funds or the economic climate of the Nation and the fact that the total demand for credit now and for the foreseeable future is expected to far exceed the available credit from regular loan sources.

In effect, the National Development Bank is the only thing that has so far been proposed that is capable of fulfilling the promise repeatedly made by Congress to provide a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family, regardless of economic conditions.

#### BLIND OPPOSITION

Mr. Speaker, the opponents of the National Development Bank for housing are blindly insisting that bank obligations will not constitute a prudent investment for pension funds, foundations or any other investor. The assertion is being made by the same people who have guided noninsured private pension investments to the point where they now have 55 percent of their assets in common stock with the result that in recent months pension funds and their beneficiaries have suffered disastrous losses.

I invite those pension funds that have invested heavily in LTV stock, for example, to compare the value of that investment to Development Bank obligations. One particular stock on the stock exchange in May was worth one-eighth the price quoted for it when it reached its peak in 1969. Development Bank obligations, on the other hand, would have yields equal to comparable Treasury obligations, be negotiable and fully and unconditionally guaranteed.

I suggest that the pension fund administrator who would put the assets of his program into common stock rather than Development Bank obligations, during present market conditions, should be promptly removed from office for the protection of the fund beneficiaries.

#### IRONIC HISTORY

By the same token, it should be pointed out that the history of pension funds in this Nation, with a few exceptions on the part of labor unions, has been marked by a glaring irony. These funds, which now have assets totaling \$126.2 billion and are designed to safeguard the welfare of retired workers, have never been used to any substantial degree to improve the welfare of workers during their long years of employment. Instead of gigantic investments in the stock market, the assets of these funds could have been far better utilized in providing mortgage loans at reasonable rates for the families of workers covered by these programs.

The fact that this has not occurred is a reflection of the nearly complete failure of pension fund administrators to recognize any social obligation in return for the enormous tax advantages the funds enjoy.

Administration spokesmen in the House, in opposing title V of the bill, say that it does not go to the Nation's housing crisis because it would take time to organize the Development Bank and place it in operation. These people have a strange view of the housing crisis. They sound as if it will be gone over-

night if Congress only provides more interest rate subsidies. As I pointed out a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, interest rate subsidies, although useful during normal economic conditions when mortgage funds are adequate and interest rates are reasonable, do little if anything to answer housing needs when mortgage funds are not available.

But the main point to be made on this issue is that the Nation's housing crisis is going to exist for years. The Nation is not going to be able to meet the annual housing goal and produce 2.6 million new and rehabilitated housing units overnight—not when housing starts are now at a level of 1.2 million units.

A realistic view of the situation produces the inescapable conclusion that the United States is going to have a housing crisis on its hands for some years to come. How long the crisis will last will depend on whether the Congress is going to provide ways of delivering adequate mortgage funds at reasonable rates—going to depend on establishment of vehicles like the National Development Bank for housing—and not whether it will take 6 or 8 months to organize the Bank itself. Without such new approaches, we are never going to meet our housing needs.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House, by their vote to restore the title V and the National Development Bank for Housing to the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970, will give clear indication as to whether this Congress intends to meet the national housing crisis—whether this Congress will make this bill more than an empty gesture in the face of the worst housing crisis since the end of World War II.

#### THE LATE ROBERT E. McCORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sorrowful heart that I take the floor this afternoon to share with my colleagues my great esteem for our senior staff member on the House Education and Labor Committee, the late Robert E. McCord.

Bob was appointed chief clerk of the committee on the convening of the 90th Congress in 1967.

Because of his distinguished service with the committee as the staff director of both Labor and Education Subcommittees, it seemed fitting to the members of the committee at the time of his appointment that he also be given the title of senior specialist.

In that capacity he has served through some of the most active and productive years of the committee.

I am not the only member of our committee who has treasured his wise counsel. As the staff director of the General Subcommittee on Education under the chairmanship of the late Cleveland Bailey, Bob not only provided the committee with expert staff assistance in connection with the Federal impact aid to education programs but contributed substantially to the committee's work on

the National Defense Education Act and to our committee hearings and analyses of education legislation in the following years which laid the foundation for the enactment of the higher education, elementary and secondary education and vocational education legislation of the 1960's.

His contribution to the legislative responsibilities of the House Education and Labor Committee was not, however, confined to the field of education.

As staff director of the Special Subcommittee on Labor under the chairmanship of FRANK THOMPSON, he provided expert staff assistance in connection with the Service Contract Act and worked extensively with the subcommittee in the development of the Arts and Humanities Act.

Bob brought to the committee in 1956 a wide range of experience. He graduated from Occidental College in Los Angeles in 1931.

He served as a reporter for the Los Angeles Record in 1931 and 1932.

He worked in public relations with the U.S. Census Bureau from 1935 to 1937.

Bob enlisted in the U.S. Navy in 1943 and was a lieutenant in the U.S. Naval Reserve upon his honorable discharge in 1946.

From 1949 through 1952, he was the owner and managing editor of the Washington News Service.

He was an agent with the Peoples Life Insurance Co. Until his death he also served on the board of directors of that company.

His chosen profession was the field of journalism, and in this respect he represents the best of his profession. In his work for the committee he was an expert at getting the facts and he combined this skill with a precision in reporting them accurately.

Because I admired his effective work I would like to think there are many things we had in common. One thing I know we did share was a love for the Appalachian area to which we were both native. He as a West Virginian and I as a Kentuckian shared an appreciation for the beauty of the hills and a concern for the need for broadened educational and employment opportunities in Appalachia.

Although he has lived here in the District of Columbia most of the time his roots and ties were strong to Wellsburg, W. Va., where he was born on October 22, 1910, the son of George W. and Eva E. "Nelson" McCord.

While speaking these words of respect for my dear friend, I would also extend at this time my condolences to his many close friends and in particular to his wife, Audrey, to his mother, Mrs. Eva E. McCord, to his sister, Bertha, and to his brother, George.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very sorry to read in the newspapers of the death of Bob McCord, who was a very valuable member of the staff of the Committee on Education and Labor, and who has rendered outstanding service in various ca-

pacities for years to the committee and to Members of the House in the performance of their duties.

Bob McCord was highly respected and admired. He was a dedicated member of the staff of the great Committee on Education and Labor. He worked untiringly in the service of the committee and when necessary long hours in the deliberations of that committee both in public hearings and in executive session, as well as on the floor of the House when bills of the committee were under consideration.

His passing leaves behind him countless friends who mourn the fact that he will not be with us in the years that lie ahead.

His wife will derive great consolation from the knowledge that Bob McCord enjoyed the friendship and respect not only of the members of the committee he served but also of countless Members of the House of Representatives, present Members and past Members.

I extend to Mrs. McCord and her loved ones my deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it was with a deep sense of shock and sadness that I learned of the untimely passing of Bob McCord, who earned the admiration of the Members for his professional skill and craftsmanship in connection with the landmark education legislation that became law during his 14 years as service on the House Committee on Education and Labor. As a Representative from the State of West Virginia, I am particularly proud of the outstanding service of a fellow West Virginian.

Bob McCord's work touched the lives of millions of students, ranging from the preschool youngster to the college graduate student. It touched them in a myriad of ways—hot lunches, school nutrition, equipment, better facilities, books, arts, and humanities. Bob's fine hand was there helping to draft these programs which became law in order to make our schools better places to learn. I join with the Speaker, and the gentleman from Kentucky, the outstanding chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor with whom Bob was a native of Wellsburg, W. Va., and another West Virginian, the late and beloved Honorable Cleveland M. Bailey made him staff director of the House General Subcommittee on Education 14 years ago. Then Bob was staff director of the Special Subcommittee on Labor, under the Honorable FRANK THOMPSON before my good friend and Kentucky neighbor, the Honorable Chairman CARL PERKINS, appointed him chief clerk and senior specialist of the committee.

Bob was a member of that coterie of professional staff people known as "The Third House." In my judgment, if there were such a position, he would be Speaker of that august body. To his widow and family, I extend my deepest sympathy.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY).

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sad heart that I join in the tribute today to my friend, Robert E. McCord, whose death on Sunday, June 21, is keenly felt especially by all members of the Education and Labor Committee and by all others who were fortunate enough to come in contact with him during his many years on Capitol Hill.

Bob was a capable and devoted employee on the staff of the House Education and Labor Committee. He was inestimable assistance to me during my 5 and a half years on the committee. He never failed to have the right answer to my many and varied questions. I shall miss him very much and I know that his shoes in the committee will be hard to fill.

To his family, I extend my deepest sympathy in their loss.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I share the deep sense of sadness expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky at the sudden loss of our friend and coworker, Robert E. McCord. This House is fortunate to have the services of many outstanding employees. None of them, however, performed his job more diligently or with greater devotion than did Bob McCord.

It was my privilege to serve on the great Committee on Education and Labor in the 90th Congress and at that time I had occasion to work very closely with Bob. Not only was he an outstanding committee employee, knowledgeable in the business of that committee and in the business of the House, but no one could have been more agreeable to work with than he. The House of Representatives has benefited greatly by his service. We shall all miss him greatly.

Mrs. Albert and the members of my staff join me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Bob's wife, mother, and family.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I join today with my colleagues who have expressed their grief at the passing of our good friend and invaluable counselor, Robert McCord, chief clerk of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Bob McCord has served this House and each of its Members for many years. He was here, and a veteran of the House, when I first took the oath, and it is hard for me to conceive of this House and particularly of the Committee on Education and Labor without the sound advice and dry wit of Bob McCord.

I will not take much of the time of the House, Mr. Speaker, because our grief will not be assuaged by words, nor will our loss be made good by talking about it. Let me say only that Robert McCord richly earned the epitaph which many of us would consider the highest praise that can be afforded a staff member or a Member of this body. He was a loyal, faithful, and loving servant of this House. He understood it, he knew its traditions and its capabilities, and he helped

make it function better than it would have without him.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, the untimely and tragic death of Bob McCord, chief counsel of our House Education and Labor Committee, leaves this Congress with a great sense of loss. We shall greatly miss his presence and we shall never be able to pay due tribute to the role he has played in the shaping of the domestic policies of this Nation.

At this moment, I am shamefully aware of my negligence during those times when I should have made known my appreciation to Bob McCord. The responsibilities which fell on him were vast and his performance was always equal the challenge.

As a new member of the committee, I very quickly learned the value of Bob's experience and his counsel. Quietly, but steadily, he took on the tasks—turning the voices and views of interests, public servants, and Presidents into the structure of the legislative process.

We always expected Bob McCord to be on top of all the issues. We always expected him to know the answers to all our questions. And somehow he always was ready with the expertise and the guidance we sought. He was never caught short of the faith we had in him. He worked behind scenes but he was always one step ahead of the demands placed upon him.

The service and career of Bob McCord stands as a monument to the work of committee staff members who keep the wheels of Congress turning. It serves to remind us that we too seldom give credit where this credit is most surely due.

Belatedly, today, we state our respect and our gratitude for the man and the contributions of Bob McCord. We convey our esteem to his family in their time of grief and we offer our thanks that they shared with us the time Bob McCord spent in life and for the hours that he toiled for the Congress of the United States. His death was sudden and found us unprepared, though we could not have prepared for the loss of this man.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join with the Honorable CARL PERKINS, Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, and my colleagues, to express my heartfelt loss over the recent and completely unexpected death of Bob McCord, the chief clerk and senior specialist of the House Education and Labor Committee.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to first meet Bob McCord in 1934. At that time he was a most responsible newspaper reporter and I knew him during his service with the U.S. Census Bureau.

At a later date, Bob was employed with the House of Representatives under the able leadership of the late Congressman Cleveland M. Bailey of my home State of West Virginia who was the dean of the West Virginia congressional delegation.

During Mr. McCord's association with the House Education and Labor Committee, I enjoyed the privilege of relying upon him for his wise counsel and advice on legislative matters in which his knowledge was unexcelled.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has lost one of its most valuable and knowledgeable staff members from a major committee of the House and in the days to come, we will miss the guidance and counsel of our mutual friend in the field of complicated and complex legislation.

During these long years of close association with the late Mr. McCord, I learned to respect and admire his responsibility and his dedication to public concern. Bob was my friend and I join with each of you in extending to his family my deepest heartfelt sympathy during the dark days that they have because he has been called to the greater life.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, our days ahead will be more difficult because we have relied upon the knowledge and experience of this man of dedication.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, along with my colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee, I join in expressing my sorrow to Mrs. McCord on the loss of her husband, Bob.

We on the Republican side were always impressed with Bob McCord's dedication to his job. A man with his ability and loyalty will be difficult to replace.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I join virtually the entire membership of the House of Representatives in expressing my profound sense of loss due to the untimely passing of our valued employee, Robert E. McCord.

As chief clerk and senior specialist of the House Committee on Education and Labor, Bob McCord exemplified the ideals of ability and service among our professional staff personnel.

He cannot be replaced. As a member of the committee, I have had the privilege on numerous occasions of benefiting from his sound guidance and advice.

His knowledge of legislation was intimate and perspective. He had an outstanding manager's instinct for keeping our committee functioning efficiently and smoothly.

Bob spent much of his adult life on Capitol Hill. His roots run to his birth in West Virginia and residence in California as a young man. A graduate of Occidental College, he was a newspaper reporter, life insurance agent, public relations official, and Washington editor prior to joining the committee staff in 1954.

As the principal staff member of our committee, he drew on this wide-ranging background and expertise to help draft and enact some of the most sweeping legislation ever passed in this country. During his career the House passed not only one but numerous landmarks bills in the fields of education and labor.

Bob McCord has left his imprint on all of these programs which have such a deep and beneficial impact on our society. Millions of our people who never knew Bob have nonetheless gained through his efforts and accomplishments.

He has helped the chairman and all members of the committee, myself included, do a better job. We are all in his

debt, and we will deeply miss this most able and gentle man.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), and others, relating to the late Robert E. McCord.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, that I were articulate enough to tell the Members of the House exactly what sort of a fellow Bob McCord was and how deeply I feel the loss of one of the greatest friends and associates I have ever had. Bob was an absolutely perfect gem of a man. He was brilliant, helpful, friendly and, above all, loyal to the House of Representatives and the people with whom he worked.

I first met Bob McCord in January 1955. We became friends immediately, and I am proud to say that our friendship grew over the years. Mr. McCord served our former colleague, James Quigley, of Pennsylvania, with distinction and then became associated with our late colleague, Cleveland Bailey, of West Virginia, as counsel to an education subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, no professional staff member knew more of the legislative process, and of the most minute details of labor and education legislation than did Bob McCord. He was a master of the legislative art, and he was one who applied his great knowledge to the interests of children and working people who were less fortunate. He was a great and compassionate man.

I was fortunate enough to have Bob McCord as counsel to the Select Subcommittee on Education, which I chaired for several years. With Bob's help and guidance we were able to legislate to help the blind, the deaf, the underprivileged, and those with an appreciation of the beautiful things in our national life. My colleagues and I came to call Bob McCord "The Counselor," and with good reason. He knew the answer to all of our questions, and his advice was unfailingly accurate.

Bob McCord worked on the Hill not because it was economically necessary for him to do so, Mr. Speaker. His business talents were such that he could, and did, earn a much greater salary in private business. He worked with us because he loved people and wanted to help them.

In 1967 our great friend and colleague from Kentucky, CARL PERKINS, became chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor and literally stole "Counselor" McCord from me. One can hardly blame Mr. PERKINS, for he recognized the "Counselor's" skills and needed him for a more important position. Bob did perfectly, as expected, and all of us were the beneficiaries of his remarkable abilities.

I shall not belabor the point, Mr. Speaker. Bob McCord, the "Counselor," was a beloved friend who can never be replaced. I can say only that I am proud to have had the honor of his friendship and the benefit of his counsel. All of us extend to his widow, Audrey, and to his family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker,

words cannot describe the shock and sorrow I felt this week upon learning of the death of Robert McCord, chief clerk for the Education and Labor Committee.

Since my appointment to the Education and Labor Committee in January 1965, I had developed a deep friendship and profound admiration for Bob McCord. He was knowledgeable, cooperative, efficient, and friendly; an unfailing source of information on any matter relating to the committee or its activities.

His journalistic background, his service in the U.S. Navy during World War II, and his 14 years on the Education and Labor Committee staff had given him a broad insight into humanity and into its many problems. Bob was especially well versed, naturally, in the problems of education and labor. All the members of the committee depended strongly upon his knowledge and experience, and he never let us down.

Bob's wisdom and cheerfulness will be sorely missed by those of us who worked so closely with him.

To his wife, mother, brother, and sister, I extend my condolences, but I know that their grief is tempered somewhat in the knowledge that Bob lived a full and satisfying life, that he leaves a wide circle of friends, and that he contributed immeasurably to the betterment of mankind through his dedicated efforts.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, very early in my career as a public servant, I discovered that an elected official can only be as successful as the staff which surrounds him allows him to become. Bob McCord was part of a staff which has contributed to the success of all of whom he served on the Education and Labor Committee. The sudden, shocking loss of Bob's friendship and assistance is something from which none of us will quickly or easily recover.

Aside from being an able and astute political assistant, Bob was a deep and cultured man. He contributed much as a personal friend, and I deeply regret that the pressures of our work often precluded the opportunities to enjoy and explore that relationship further.

Mrs. Dent and I extend our deepest sympathy to Bob's family, and I wish to join Chairman PERKINS today in his great sorrow over the loss of a fine colleague.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to add my comments to those made by my colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee in memory of our good friend, Bob McCord.

Even though I had been a member of the Education and Labor Committee for less than 1½ years, I have had more than ample time to become acquainted with Bob McCord and to assess his superior qualities.

In my opinion, his dedication to good, sound, responsible government was an example to all of us who had the great privilege of knowing him and working with him.

Furthermore, he was sincere, modest, friendly, accurate, dependable, and hard working.

I wish to associate myself with the statement made by our Committee Chairman CARL PERKINS who said:

He was my good friend, he was an exceptionally able, loyal and gentle man. He more than anyone saw to it that the Committee ran smoothly. He can never be replaced. Ours is a deep, deep loss.

To the family of Bob McCord. I extend my sincere sympathy.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sense of real sadness that I learned of the death last Sunday of Robert McCord, chief clerk of the House Education and Labor Committee.

During my service on that committee I had occasion to work closely with Bob. His was not an easy job, as the jurisdiction of the committee is broad and the matters with which he dealt were often controversial. During those years I found Bob an extremely conscientious and highly capable individual.

His colleagues on the committee staff, his associates on Capitol Hill, and the many Members with whom he came in contact will certainly miss him.

I should like to take this opportunity to extend to his family my deepest personal sympathy.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing deep sorrow at the untimely passing of Robert E. McCord, who served with distinction as chief clerk to the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Bob was a great help to the Members of this body, both those who served on the committee, and those of us who did not. He was always available to give counsel and advice to a Member who brought him a problem relating to his committee work.

Bob joined the House Committee on Education and Labor in 1956 and worked his way up from staff member to chief clerk and senior specialist. His experience was invaluable to the committee and to the Congress over those 14 years, a naval veteran and former newspaper reporter, Bob owned and edited the Washington News Service before joining the House committee.

I extend my personal sympathies to his wife, Audrey, and I join with all who knew Bob in remembering his commitment to public service.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

#### VOTE ON PRESIDENT'S VETO OF HILL-BURTON ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BUSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House is scheduled to vote on whether or not to override the Presi-

dent's veto of the Hill-Burton Act. This is an extremely critical vote. Unavoidable personal reasons prevent my being in Washington when the vote is taken. Therefore, I feel compelled to make my position clear today.

I support the Hill-Burton program. I have always supported it. I believe this to be one of the most successful programs in existence. The goal of increasing hospital beds is even more critical today than it was when the program was instituted.

But, this is not a vote for or against health care. In fiscal year 1971 there will be a 28-percent increase in health outlays. There will be increases in programs affecting family planning, heart and cancer research, alcoholism and drug abuse and a revision of medicare and programs providing medical aid to the poor.

The President's objection to the bill, H.R. 11102, is not to the high priority Congress has given Hill-Burton funds; but, rather, to that section of the bill—section 601—which requires that all funds appropriated be spent.

Our constituents are screaming for reductions in Federal spending. The House has placed a \$395 billion spending limitation on the President for fiscal year 1971. Yet, in this bill we have required that "every dime" appropriated be spent.

I just do not think we can take such a limited view. Congress has to look at the total economic picture. We have to view all legislation in the context of the projected \$1.3 billion deficit for fiscal year 1971 and the effect this deficit is going to have on the pocketbooks of every American. We are now seeing—in high prices and general economic instability—the effects of 8 years of budgetary deficits amounting to a total of \$60.2 billion. We have to take into account the wishes of our constituents that "Government spending be cut" and that priorities in spending be established. We have to take into account that there are other programs of equal importance—education, health care, pollution control, et cetera. And, finally, we have to take into account the fact that the President considers this one section so onerous that he would veto the bill to see it removed.

Taking all these factors into account, were I present tomorrow, I would vote to sustain the veto.

I am a cosponsor of the bill introduced today which is identical to H.R. 11102—the vetoed bill—except that it deletes section 601 which requires the President to spend all funds appropriated. This new bill provides for a 3 year \$2.79 billion authorization for construction and modernization of health facilities. I am confident it will give this program the needed impetus to meet its objectives. I repeat, I am for Hill-Burton, but I am not for telling the President "restrict spending" then removing any leeway he might have from living within a ceiling. I am confident that the new Hill-Burton will pass but I want it done without section 601.

#### FOREIGN TRADE LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, it has been 8 years since this body has been presented with an opportunity to consider through legislation essential changes in our Nation's foreign trade policy. The Committee on Ways and Means has been holding hearings on the subject of foreign trade legislation. I appeared before that committee to present them with information concerning the problems of the manufacturing industries which are located in my district. These industries are part of important national industries which are being seriously affected by unregulated imports.

The loss of employment and the deterioration in our Nation's balance of trade and payments caused by the failure of our existing foreign trade machinery to correct these situations urgently require strong measures by the Congress. I know that there is considerable sentiment among my colleagues in this body to take such action when the opportunity is presented to us. We are glad that the Committee on Ways and Means is studying foreign trade legislation, and we look forward to an early opportunity to act upon a bill which will carry out essential reforms in our foreign trade policy and practice. I believe it will be helpful to other Members of this body to consider the information which I presented to the Committee on Ways and Means on this subject.

There are 12 major manufacturing industries operating in my district. They employ 21,514 of my constituents in well-paying American jobs. Their wages directly support about 100,000 residents of the district—about one out of every five of my constituents. Their wages, and the materials purchases and transportation services required by the plants in which they work, spent in the 11 counties of the district, provide a major economic base for service industries, retail establishments, churches, hospitals, and school districts in my district. The homes of these industrial workers, the plants in which they work, and the facilities of the service and transportation industries which serve them, together form a major part of the tax base of the local communities in my district. Altogether, these 12 industries are the indispensable source of economic activity in my district.

The majority of these industries are suffering acutely from excessive import competition. Their workers have suffered job layoffs, and short-time work. Unemployment and underemployment have become again a specter in my district. Three of 11 counties in my district were classified by the Labor Department as of March 1, 1970, as areas of substantial unemployment.

In the following table I have listed the particulars of the industries in my district which have already sustained market disruption and economic injury from excessive imports:

TABLE 1.—IMPORT-IMPACTED DOMESTIC INDUSTRIES WITH PRODUCTION FACILITIES IN THE 1ST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

SIC No.	Name of industry	Employment in 1st district, Tennessee, March 1968	U.S. imports (in millions)		Percent change	National employment in the industry (in thousands)		
			1964	1969		1964	1969	February-March 1970
2032	Canned specialties.....	750	1.1 lb.	2.5 lb.	+127	25.7	32.1	23.4
22	Textile mill products.....	1,535	752.3 sq yd.	1,674.8 sq yd.	+123	892.0	987.0	961.3
23	Apparel and related products.....	2,628	560.7 sq yd.	1,518.1 sq yd.	+171	1,302.5	1,417.5	1,404.3
2511	Wood household furniture.....	2,525	\$32.6	\$74.5	+129	151.6	179.6	168.4
2892	Explosives.....	2,000	3.2 lb.	18.3 lb.	+469	17.9	45.5	37.4
321	Flat glass.....	1,559	486.1 sq ft.	569.2 sq ft.	+17	30.8	25.9	24.9
365	Radio and TV receivers.....	2,000	\$243.6	\$939.9	+268	118.8	154.6	131.8

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1967 Census of Manufactures, 1968 County Business Patterns, IM 146, FT 135, FT 246 (1964, 1969); U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Earnings Statistics of the United States, 1909-68; Mar.-Apr. 1970.

These seven industries have sustained a loss of 90,000 jobs by February or March 1970 compared with the average level of employment in 1969. The flat glass industry won a finding of serious injury and a finding that the tariff on sheet glass should be restored to the statutory level from the Tariff Commission, but the free traders in the executive branch persuaded the President not to do so. The textile and apparel industries have been waiting patiently for the

administration to negotiate one or more international agreements to limit imports of textile articles. The executive branch has failed, but still opposes legislative action by your committee.

The electronic products industry sought to have the Executive exercise the right of the United States to modify radio and TV duties, raising them to the level of 25 percent, under the "open season" procedure of article XXVIII of GATT, but the Special Representative

for Trade Negotiations squashed that move.

The name of the game in the executive branch is refuse to help any domestic industry or group of workers being hurt by imports, and talk, talk, talk while the problem goes away or the industry and its workers give up in despair.

There are three other industries in my district which are acutely vulnerable to administration policy in the trade area. They are shown in the following table:

TABLE 2.—IMPORT-SENSITIVE DOMESTIC INDUSTRIES WITH PRODUCTION FACILITIES IN THE 1ST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE THREATENED BY CURRENT ADMINISTRATION TRADE POLICIES

SIC No.	Name of industry	Employment in 1st district, Tennessee, March 1968	U.S. imports (in millions)		Percent change	National employment in the industry (in thousands)		
			1964	1969		1964	1969	February-March 1970
2818	Industrial organic chemicals.....	2,000	\$104.0	\$245.4	+136	111.1	124.2	125.5
2821	Plastics and resins.....	2,000	14.8 lb.	64.2 lb.	+334	80.9	97.3	98.0
2823, 2824	Man-made fibers.....	3,983	208.2 lb.	473.6 lb.	+127	87.4	114.0	114.6

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1967 Census of Manufactures, 1968 County Business Patterns, IM 146, FT 135, FT 246 (1964, 1969). U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Earnings Statistics of the United States, 1909-68; Mar.-Apr. 1970.

Industrial organic chemicals and plastics and resins are industries whose production and employment are protected in large part from import injury by the American selling price system of customs valuation. The administration seeks to persuade you to repeal ASP. Virtually the sole beneficiary will be Germany whose export trade surpluses are so large that the whole Western World is concerned about the effect on the financial structure of world trade. These industries are at a point of equilibrium now, as the employment figures suggest. If ASP is repealed, the principal source of strength in my district will be seriously threatened. The ASP agreement was void ab initio. It should never have been negotiated. It should not now be honored by the Congress.

The manmade fiber producing industry is one of the largest employers of manufacturing labor in my district. Its operations are adversely affected by every pound of manmade fiber which is imported into the country, whether in the form of fiber, fabric, or apparel. The full burden of manmade fiber textile imports rests on this industry, and threatens the welfare of the largest group of workers in my district. The administration, while commendably doing its best to negotiate an agreement to limit imports of manmade fiber textile products, opposes the inclusion of the basic fiber products in the agreement. What is worse, the Secretary of Commerce has

leveled his lance at the definition of textile articles in H.R. 16920, introduced by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and seeks to persuade you to delete manmade staple fiber and filaments from the definition, and thus from the scope of the bill. Were the Committee on Ways and Means to honor his request, it would directly harm the interests of the workers in the manmade fiber plants in my district. To the extent that the Congress creates import-regulating machinery which leaves the fibers loophole for the foreign fiber producers themselves out, it provides a gaping to pour their surplus fiber production through without limitation. I earnestly ask that this not be done.

In summary of my testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, I made the following requests:

First, that the committee stick by its guns and report out H.R. 16920 as now written; keep manmade staple fiber and filaments in the bill;

Second, that the committee reject title IV of the administration bill; retain ASP;

Third, that the committee expand H.R. 16920 to include flat glass and electronic products, as is done in a group of bills pending before the Ways and Means Committee, typified by my bill, H.R. 13941;

Fourth, that the committee expand H.R. 16920, to include ladies' handbags. Imports are adversely affecting the ladies' handbag industry in the United

States as the Japanese are copying and sending their merchandise back to the United States at a much lesser price; and

Fifth, that the committee reform the escape clause as title II of H.R. 16920 would do to make the Tariff Commission findings of injury and of the duty increase or quotas needed to correct the injury binding on the President; let us have no more sheet glass or piano cases where free traders in the executive branch torpedo authentic Tariff Commission findings of injury and needed relief.

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE STAND ON MAJOR PROPOSALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, every department of the executive branch of Government except the Department of Agriculture has taken a stand on major proposals before the Congress. The USDA waited until March 1970 before submitting its concepts and philosophy of legislation to the Congress. During these many months, many meetings have been held, many conferences have occurred, and serious efforts have been made by every segment of the agricultural community in an attempt to cooperate with the administration in producing new farm legislation. Nonetheless, the ad-

ministration has not to this date made firm its position relative to the proposals being considered.

As one member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I have been very disappointed in the lack of leadership, lack of imagination, and the lack of initiative shown by the USDA.

I have seen no evidence during the past 17 months that the Department of Agriculture is committed to helping the farmers of northeast Arkansas. As a matter of fact, the Department of Agriculture has failed in the greatest task facing us during this period—the development of new farm legislation.

For example, I have been trying for over a month to discover the administration's position on the various farm proposals under consideration by the committee. In a letter to Secretary Hardin dated May 28, 1970, I asked if legislation sent to the committee last February by the USDA represented administration proposals. If it did not, I asked, did they disagree with those proposals?

The reply received June 10, 1970, from an Under Secretary of Agriculture merely restated that the administration has not submitted its proposals to the Congress, even though it has had 17 months to develop its position. My second question asking whether the USDA disagreed with the proposals it had submitted to the Committee was conveniently ignored.

On June 15, 1970, I sent a second letter to the Department of Agriculture repeating that question. No answer has been received to date.

It is now becoming questionable whether any commitment by the Department of Agriculture can be accepted unless it is reduced to writing. Earlier this year, Department spokesmen said it was supporting a farm payment limitation of a fixed amount. Spokesmen now say they have no commitment on this important subject and that it is now considering a lower figure.

I ask, Where does the USDA stand? It is said that new farm legislation cannot be passed through the Congress without administration support. I ask, How can that support be obtained when the USDA apparently cannot decide where it stands on legislative proposals?

I say again that it is time for the Department of Agriculture to begin considering the needs of the Nation's farmers and to represent their interests within the administration. It is time for the administration to decide whether it is with the farmers of this Nation or against them. The letter follows:

MAY 28, 1970.

HON. CLIFFORD HARDIN,  
Secretary, Department of Agriculture,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Enclosed is a transcript of remarks reportedly made by William E. Galbraith, Deputy Under Secretary for Congressional Relations, concerning farm proposals now under consideration. As I interpret Mr. Galbraith's remarks, he says that the USDA has not submitted any legislative recommendations to Congress. Does this statement reflect the official position of you and the Department of Agriculture? If it does not, are you then saying that you are not in agreement with the proposed legislation

which was sent to the members of the Committee in February by your department?

Looking forward to hearing from you in the immediate future, I am

Sincerely,

BILL ALEXANDER,  
Congressman from Arkansas, First District.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, D.C., June 10, 1970.

HON. BILL ALEXANDER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ALEXANDER: I am happy to clarify the Department's position regarding farm proposals as requested in your letter of May 28 to Secretary Hardin.

I believe the problem you have raised is largely a matter of semantics. Secretary Hardin has always maintained that there can be no single architect of a new farm program—that it needs the best ideas that the members of the Congress, the farm organizations, and other interested groups can offer, as well as the Secretary of Agriculture.

However, to get such a consideration into operation, you have to start with something more or less specific to talk about—otherwise you get mostly a debate over philosophies. To get the ball rolling, so to speak, the Secretary submitted a document which in the Secretary's words was not a legislative proposal as such, but rather a step in arriving at an ultimate consensus that will be considered sound, workable and acceptable to the Congress, the Administration, farmers and the general public.

The Department made clear that this draft was not the Department's final position . . . that in fact it was subject to further change. Thus it was not an Administration legislation proposal as such, but rather a step in the process of working with the Agriculture Committee in arriving at the ultimate product—a farm bill.

Sincerely,

J. PHIL CAMPBELL,  
Under Secretary.

JUNE 15, 1970.

MR. J. PHIL CAMPBELL,  
Under Secretary, Office of the Secretary,  
Department of Agriculture, Washington,  
D.C.

DEAR MR. CAMPBELL: Your letter of June 10 in answer to my earlier letter asking for information concerning USDA farm legislation proposals was appreciated. As I understand your reply, you said that Mr. Galbraith's remarks were accurate and that the Department of Agriculture has not sent any legislative proposals to the Congress.

I did not find any comments in your letter; however, that addressed themselves to my second question. That was, "If it does not (reflect the official position of the USDA), are you then saying that you are not in agreement with the proposed legislation which was sent to the members of the Committee in February by your department?"

I am sure that you can understand that my only intention is in finding out for myself, and for the farmers that I represent, what the position of the Department of Agriculture and the Administration really is. Do the proposals sent to the Committee earlier this year represent the position of the Administration or do they not? If they do not, do you have any intention of submitting proposals to the Committee on Agriculture?

Constituents have repeatedly asked me for the position of the Administration on various farm proposals. It has been most confusing trying to explain to them a situation I do not understand myself. Clarification of this problem would be most appreciated.

With kindest personal regards, I am  
Sincerely yours,

BILL ALEXANDER,  
Congressman from Arkansas, First District.

## THE PROBLEMS OF PENN CENTRAL

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, many newspapers in recent days have taken the trouble to place the bankruptcy of the Penn Central in context.

Many editorial columns and letters to the editors have contributed greatly to a better public understanding of the basic issues involved in the case. Also, I have received many thoughtful letters and telegrams from people all over the Nation concerning the problems of this giant corporation.

A particularly thought-provoking letter was sent me by Mr. Douglas Cram of Greenwich, Conn., and I want to place a copy of this correspondence in the RECORD. I also place in the RECORD editorials and columns on Penn Central which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Journal of Commerce, the Wall Street Journal, and the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

The material follows:

GREENWICH, CONN.,  
June 18, 1970.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It appears than in the haste to "do something" about the possibility of the Penn Central going into bankruptcy, substantial confusion has been created between what should be saved (railroad service) and what will be saved under the current rescue plans.

Bankruptcy would in no way destroy the railroad assets; it is merely a mechanism for ascertaining priorities in those equities. Thus, bankruptcy threatens not the railroad, per se, but the shareholders. We should therefore separate the problem of the railroad, which must be kept running from that of the shareholders, which I will discuss later.

I will grant that the rail assets of the Penn Central are crucial to our transportation network. Thus, the trains must be kept running and service must remain intact. It seems very obvious that there is some price at which someone would bid for the Penn Central complex including long run passenger trains, commuter service, ICC regulation, etc. That price would probably be in excess of the money currently due all creditors. In fact, it might even be more than the amount owed creditors plus the current market value of the stock. In any case, it could be sold. The worst that could happen is that a COMSAT-type corporation would be needed to provide the capital if no other bidder appears.

The successor corporation would be required to liquidate non-railroad assets to raise capital for running the line. Even if no improvement in the line's efficiency was made, the railroad could run at its present (bad) fashion almost indefinitely on the cash freed by the liquidation of non-railroad assets. During this period, Congress could presumably work out some plan to rationalize this nation's haphazard transportation system from top to bottom.

Thus, it is obvious that the railroad can be preserved without bailing out Penn Central Co. My next point is that Penn Central Co. should not be bailed out. What is in fact being proposed is that the current shareholders, for some arbitrary reason, receive

a considerable public asset (a government-guaranteed loan) which other shareholders do not receive. It is arbitrary for several reasons.

1. It would reward present shareholders over past shareholders. Many of the shareholders who bought the stock at manifestly higher levels have already sold their stock. Their loss was several times greater than that now being risked by existing shareholders. Additionally, many present shareholders bought it as a speculation, knowing full well the risks. Finally, many present shareholders benefited directly from the denuding of railroad assets by years of high dividends. They were living beyond their means; they ought to be estopped to complain.

2. It would single out one industry for government protection. If the industry is to be risk-free, then there is no justification for allowing profits at all, for profit is the reward for risk.

3. It would remove one of the great goods to management performance—the threat of failure. This threat of failure is a powerful incentive to ingenuity and thrift. Once gone, the major corporations would become as moribund as any of the non-competitive economies of Eastern Europe.

I thank you for your attention to my thoughts and trust that it will have some impact on your thinking.

Very truly yours,

DOUGLAS CRAM.

[From the Washington Star, June 23, 1970]

PENN CENTRAL CASE AND U.S. POLICY

(By Milton Viorst)

When Deputy Defense Secretary David Packard told a closed session of the House Appropriations Committee some weeks ago that the financial solvency of the Penn Central Co. was vital to the national security, his audience laughed sardonically at him.

When he said that the Navy, as a defense requirement, would guarantee \$200 million in loans to Penn Central, hardly anyone doubted that the money was as good as lost.

Had Packard not taken the transaction to the committee as a fait accompli, he would probably have received congressional sanction. After all Congress has historically been as tolerant as administrations of the curious ways of railroads.

But President Nixon, after months of secret talks, had made a private deal with Penn Central, and Congress resented it. On Friday, he was forced to back out. On Sunday, Penn Central got even by declaring itself bankrupt.

No tears, however, are required. The trains will continue to run, despite Packard, at their customary level of inefficiency. And the company's stock will be traded, in recognition of Penn Central's possession of \$7 billion in assets that it chose not to liquidate.

Actually, what the administration proposed was to give Penn Central \$200 million to perpetuate its tradition of incompetent management and disdain for the public interest.

The proposal was in the grand tradition of collusion between the nation's railroads and federal agencies, particularly the agency held responsible by law for railroad regulation, the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The previous Democratic administrations, despite the anti-trust laws, sanctioned the merger of the Pennsylvania and the New York Central, though Penn Central gave notice at the time of a cutback in service by projecting declining passenger and freight demand.

Needless to say, the prophecy was self-fulfilling. As service was reduced, demand indeed shifted to trucks and airplanes, leaving Penn Central free to diversify into a giant conglomerate.

From Penn Central's point of view, the logic was obvious: Why invest in new railroad cars, track and station facilities if there

is a better return in pipelines and luxury hotels?

The railroads' contempt for passenger traffic is, of course, legendary. Anyone who has taken a train recently has had that confirmed. But Penn Central managed even to undo its profitable freight business.

Under law, the ICC has always had the power to compel Penn-Central to run a better railroad. But as one commissioner put it recently, "We do not intend to use that jurisdiction in requiring heavy investment . . ."

Rep. Richard Ottinger, whose New York district depends on Penn-Central, has said the ICC and the railroads maintain a "working economic and personal relationship, which frequently involves the most insidious possible influence by an industry upon an agency holding the public trust."

Rep. John Dingell of Michigan has charged that the ICC's dealings are riddled with conflict of interest.

In the end, however, even the ICC's indulgence didn't save Penn-Central from its own blundering. It had invested so poorly that it lost its liquidity, and became the first major victim of the 1970 recession. It couldn't even make a deal with a President who would come through on his word.

What was particularly irritating to Congress was that the government demanded nothing in return for its generosity.

It is inconceivable that Packard did not promise, at the least, a complete government examination of Penn-Central finances.

Nor did he suggest that, as a condition of the loan, Penn Central would start showing some concern for the public.

The administration did ask for legislation authorizing a total of \$750 million in rail loans, but there was no indication that any of the money had to be directed at improved service.

What Nixon did propose—with railroad approval, of course—was a public corporation to run unprofitable passenger lines. But as long as we contemplate nationalization, why not go all the way and take over the entire industry?

Deep down, the trouble is that federal transportation policy is insane. The 1971 budget contains \$4.6 billion for roads and \$1.35 billion for aviation. It has \$23 million to improve the railroads.

No wonder Penn Central concluded that no one cared about rail service, and that it could get away with anything it wanted, including bankruptcy.

[From the New York Times, June 11, 1970]

LOW SPEED AT PENN CENTRAL

The convulsion that cost the jobs of Penn Central's board chairman Stuart T. Saunders and two key associates throws a harsh spotlight on some of the problems now plaguing American business and threatening the health of other corporations as well.

The immediate cause of Mr. Saunders's downfall was the present inflation-spawned liquidity crisis as expressed in the current very tight credit situation. By any criterion, Penn Central is one of the world's largest business enterprises and possesses huge real estate and other assets. Yet it was faced by the possibility it might be unable to meet its obligations, notably the more than \$100 million of long-term debt coming due this year. Last week Penn Central was unable to sell 25-year debentures even though it offered the once-fantastic interest rate of 10½ per cent. Penn Central has even had great trouble securing short-term loans needed for meeting payroll and other current expenses.

Two years after the merger of the Pennsylvania and New York Central, the combined railroads lost \$62.7 million just in the first quarter of 1970, a huge deficit that more than wiped out large profits earned in other areas of this conglomerate corporations' varied activities. No doubt there is a fascinating book to be written about the difficulties of

this historic corporate marriage. There is the story, for example, of the two roads' incompatible computers, and of the utter confusion—in the shape of lost freight cars and vanished business documents—that proliferated when the merger took effect. There are tales, too, of bitter rivalry between Pennsylvania and Central executives as members of the two groups jockeyed for positions and high salaries in the newly merged business organism.

The Nixon Administration's decision to help Penn Central obtain \$50 million in short-term Government-guaranteed loans reflects the need to keep this vital transport link running. A tougher question is posed by the company's long-term debt, more than \$100-million of which falls due this year. Failure to meet these obligations would mean bankruptcy that would require the Penn Central to be placed in receivership. In this case, its normal railroad and other business would continue while efforts were made to salvage as much as possible for bondholders and other creditors. The Administration evidently believes that collapse of such a major corporation would send a dangerous shock through the nation's entire financial structure, already weakened by the long stock market decline and the credit squeeze—hence the decision to provide additional hundreds of millions of dollars of Government-guaranteed longer-term loans for the Penn Central and similarly shaky carriers.

More is involved than another major contingent liability for the National Treasury. Aid to the Penn Central must not be a precedent requiring Washington to bail out every other major corporation that may run into difficulties because of the liquidity crisis, managerial incompetence or other reasons. Would it be better to let the Penn Central go bankrupt (while its railroad operations continued) on the ground that in a private-enterprise economy investors must pay the price of ill-advised decisions as well as reap the rewards of good judgment? Or is it time to think of nationalizing and unifying the nation's railroads? The measure proposed to help Penn Central must set off some serious debate about these and other fundamental questions raised by that corporation's desperate plight.

[From the Washington Post, June 17, 1970]

PENN CENTRAL'S WELFARE REQUEST

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

The Penn Central Railroad has applied for welfare. "We're an unwilling welfare client," says William A. Lashley, the company's vice president for public relations, which is what everybody who goes on welfare says.

The Penn Central wants the government to co-sign a loan for \$200 million now, and then pass a law which will enable the railroad to borrow another \$400 million on the basis of the government's promise to make good, if the money isn't paid back.

The government ought to be very careful before it puts Penn Central on the dole. Sen. Russell Long says the welfare rolls are already loaded with "professional hoboes and bums" who won't work. The way he can tell, the senator says, is that he can't get anybody to wash and stuff his shirts. One condition for giving Penn Central welfare might be that the members of its board of directors would take turns doing Senator Long's laundry.

When people go on welfare, they have to pass a means test to make sure they're not holding out any money. If you own a car, you have to sell it; the same goes for any other fancy merchandise you might have. You must be skinny dip poor to be eligible for welfare.

To certify as a pauper Penn Central will have to resort to hypnotism. The company has assets worth almost \$7 billion. Only half of these assets have any connection with railroad trains, diesel engines, freight cars

and the like. The other \$3½ billion is in real estate, hotels, sports arenas, goodness knows what else.

Like all welfare applicants Penn Central wants to get its monthly check and keep what it has. "You say we have \$7 billion in assets," Mr. Lashley explains. "We do, but it's not wise for us to sell them at fire sale, distress prices." The rest of the world has to do it when there's a sickness in the family or money is needed in a hurry, but these welfare recipients don't want to be equal; they want to be special and get something for nothing. But you know what they say about welfare recipients.

Another rule they apply when you ask for welfare is that you can't be on more than one welfare roll at a time. It's cheating to be getting a welfare check from the State of New York and the State of New Jersey. On these grounds, the Penn Central is ineligible for a handout.

Not counting the special tax concessions it enjoys, our dear old deserving seven billion dollar welfare mother has recently gotten \$11½ million for the New York to Washington Metroliner from the federal government; the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is paying it almost \$4 million a year in subsidies for its Philadelphia commuter service; the State of New Jersey is buying our charity case 115 brand spanking new railroad cars; the States of New York and Connecticut have given our suffering corporate indigent \$10 million in cash with more money promised. In addition, it has taken a \$126 million tax write-off on all its junky, old passenger train equipment west of Harrisburg, Pa.

(Bear this in mind when the Penn Central cries out its competitors, the airlines, the barges and the trucks, are subsidized. In the race to get something for nothing, the welfare mothers of America can learn a lot from the railroads, who do it without ever sitting in or demonstrating. In the last century the industry was given 131 million acres of land, some very valuable parcels of which are still owned by certain Western roads.)

Now the railroad wants the government to co-sign these gigantic notes. How valuable this guarantee can be is shown by the fact the Penn Central attempted to borrow this money at 10½ per cent interest and couldn't find a lender, but now, with the full faith and credit of the United States of America behind it, it will get its dough at the prime interest rate of around 8 per cent.

Will they ever pay it back? They already owe the government \$20 million on an old New York Central loan. Another railroad company, the Reading, has just asked the government if it may defer payments on a \$28 million loan.

Several entertaining reasons are offered as to why Penn Central should be put on welfare.

One is that the line is so big and so important it would be terrible if it went bankrupt. The reason it is so big and important is that the company is the creature of a huge merger that was urged on the public by Penn Central's managers on the grounds that bigger and more important would also be better. As it worked out in dollars and cents, bigger and more important has also meant worse service, inefficiency and bad business judgment, all of which the public is now asked to stand the expense of.

It's also alleged that bankruptcy would mean suspending indispensable railroad service to a number of military installations. Horsebleep. If the Penn Central goes bankrupt, the trains aren't going to stop at twelve-oh-one, and if it did the service is so bad many people wouldn't realize something unusual had transpired. The New York, New Haven and Hartford, among other railroads, was bankrupt, in receivership and more or less running for years.

Who's going to get hurt if the Penn Central goes into bankruptcy or has to sell off

some of its assets to pay its bills? The bond and share holders. But that's what business is about. You invest in something good, you make money; buy into an ill-managed, ineptly run enterprise, and you lose money.

One of the very real advantages of what we call the free enterprise system is that it should work to get rid of the inefficient, insufficient and inadequate. A free market is a way of seeing that a society doesn't waste valuable resources on a losing proposition.

As almost all travelers from Russia report, one of their great problems there is that they have no market, nor any other dependable mechanism for knocking out losers. So why are we emulating them? If the old Pennsy can't hack it, let it go under.

Why should incompetence be rewarded? It's had its chance. When it has a market it doesn't know how to exploit it, as anyone who's ever gone through the ordeal of buying a ticket on the Metroliner will agree. The old geezer with the green eyeshade scratching his hair and wondering how to run that goldarned computer thing, the fifth rate food, so inferior to the airlines', the delays, the hundred little ways the company tells you it's too big and too important to need the customers' dollar. And even so, the desire to take the train in preference to a plane is so strong, people keep riding it.

The decision to put the Penn Central on welfare was announced in much the same way as the Gulf of Tonkin—a big meeting with congressional leaders in a crisis atmosphere. The analogy is apt because this is a morass from which we have less chance to emerge victorious than the one in Southeast Asia.

The whole Penn Central operation, not to mention the 200 million that Lockheed aircraft wants to bail them out, all such operations—and there are many—make the government's speechmaking about free enterprise look like the most insincere cant.

If the Nixon administration wants thus to injure the free market economy and take this new step toward socialism, let it be rational socialism, let the policy have full debate, and let it not be socialism for the likes of the Penn Central and laissez-faire, survival of the fittest for the rest of us.

[From the New York Times, June 23, 1970]

#### BANKRUPT PENN CENTRAL

The reorganization of the Penn Central under the bankruptcy laws is an astonishing denouement to the high hopes for improved service and financial strength stirred by the merger of two giant railroad systems just a little over two years ago. That this corporation with nearly \$7 billion in assets should have to confess in Federal court its inability to pay its bills projects on a mammoth screen the dimensions of the liquidity crisis caused for many businesses by the current combination of inflation and recession.

Despite the shock of the Penn Central's forced bankruptcy, it is hard to find fault with the Congressional critics whose opposition obliged the Administration to back away from its plan to guarantee up to \$200 million in short-term bank loans to the rail complex. Quite apart from the appropriateness of such a commitment under the Defense Protection Act, there was scant basis for certainty that the need for Federal underwriting would end with the initial guarantee.

The appointment of trustees under Section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act will give the Penn Central a new lease on life by relieving it of its immediate obligation to pay taxes and other fixed charges as they fall due, but the experience of the New Haven makes it plain that reorganization is no panacea for an ailing railroad. Even at best, it could be twenty years before the Penn Central emerges from court supervision. For lawyers, the process will prove a guaranteed full employment program involving huge fees.

The suspension of the railroad's tax payments to states, cities and counties will aggravate local fiscal problems, already made acute by the inadequacy of aid from Washington. To that loss is added the necessity for state action of the kind now being taken by New York's Governor Rockefeller to help bolster Penn Central commuter service in metropolitan areas.

For all the woes attendant on reorganization in bankruptcy, it will keep the railroad intact and operating under court protection. If that proves insufficient, the Government may yet have to consider nationalizing a system that operates an eighth of all the country's trackage. The lines between public and private enterprise are growing increasingly cloudy in many fields, but it would make little sense to pretend that the Penn Central or other shaky roads were functioning as private corporations if the only way they could keep running was through endless infusions of Government cash.

[From the Journal of Commerce,  
June 15, 1970]

#### THE BIG RESCUE

The administration's rather hurried decision to rescue the giant Penn Central rail system has pleased some people, puzzled or alarmed others and is now rapidly becoming the subject of some sharp questioning on Capitol Hill. The questioning involves not only what was done but the manner in which it was done and what all this may presage for the future.

Initially, the Penn Central is being given government guarantees on short-term bank loans under the Defense Production Act of 1950. The official explanation is that if this aid had not been forthcoming the system would have gone bankrupt and its operations would have come to a halt, thus tying up a great deal of freight in which the Department of Defense has a direct interest. Thus the guarantees were assigned to DOD rather than some other agency, such as the Department of Commerce.

This phase of the arrangement created more puzzlement than any other. What, indeed, would have happened had the Penn Central filed a petition in bankruptcy last weekend? Essentially the same thing that happened when the New Haven went into bankruptcy in 1961. A trustee would have been appointed and the property put into reorganization under Section 77(B) of the Federal Bankruptcy Act. Unless the administration had some information that has not even yet been disclosed there was no reason to suppose that a stoppage of the company's rail operations was impending.

So there is some point to the arguments that those who say the administration's real purpose was to shield the faltering economy from the shock that bankruptcy of such an immense enterprise would create, and that its resort to DOD-backed loans for such a purpose was unwise and perhaps even deceitful.

There is also some point to the argument that the Defense Production Act's loan provisions were not meant to be employed for railroad rescue operations, but to help smaller contractors finish work that DOD considered essential. The administration perhaps feels this way, too, for it is now asking Congress to provide up to \$750 million via the Department of Transportation, which now has no statutory authority to guarantee bank loans to railroads. In other words, the Penn Central operation, which will involve perhaps \$500 million all told, is to be a one-shot proposition. Future rescues are apparently to be conducted by DOT rather than DOD.

Actually, however, there is some precedent for a resort to the Defense Production Act. After some of the New Haven's main lines in Connecticut had been devastated by

the great storms and floods of 1955 the government moved under the Defense Production Act to guaranty 90 per cent of loans aggregating \$16 million. That however, was done to enable the carrier to restore its physical plant, not to avoid a reorganization that—as matters turned out—was to come in any event. So the circumstances were not identical.

To cite the New Haven case in the same context with that of the Penn Central is bound to stir some unpleasant memories, but they are memories that still linger in the vicinity of Capitol Hill.

For the 1955 loans were only the first in a series the government would make in a fruitless effort to keep the New Haven from collapse. The others were made under a temporary section of the Transportation Act of 1958 which authorized the Interstate Commerce Commission to guarantee railroad loans made for the purpose of covering expenditures for capital improvements or maintenance.

This was a dubious piece of legislation for several reasons. One of them, pointed out by the then Secretary of Commerce, Sinclair Weeks was that it violated the well-established principle that "an agency having responsibility for regulating an industry should not also be given the responsibility for extension of financial assistance to such industry." In that respect the situation for several years running was akin to that prevailing in the old Maritime Commission which had been charged with regulating the very industry it was also charged with promoting.

Another doubtful feature of the assistance given the New Haven under the Defense Production and Interstate Commerce Acts became apparent as soon as the New Haven finally collapsed. The government had no status whatever among the railroad's creditors. It had not extended the loans itself. It had merely guaranteed them. It had no alternative but pay up.

The legislation now being sought by the administration would meet at least one of the objections raised to the 1958 loan-guaranty program, which was wisely allowed to expire after the New Haven went under. It would be administered by DOT, rather than ICC, so it would not force any agency into the dual role of banker and regulator.

But it may well raise other and broader problems especially if, as presently indicated, the Penn Central may need very extensive help and that some other railroads may soon be seeking it, too. How far can the government go without finding itself on the threshold of railroad nationalization? To what extent, if any, should it interfere with management to protect the public's investment? Where will it all end? These are among the questions already being asked in Congress. We shall try to deal with some of them in tomorrow's editorial.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 22, 1970]

#### REVIEW AND OUTLOOK: BAILING OUT THE PENN CENTRAL

No one was entirely happy with the Government's plan to guarantee sizable loans to the Penn Central Transportation Co., and perhaps the Administration was correct in withdrawing from its promise for the time being. In the circumstances, though, some such action now seems inevitable.

Under the bankruptcy petition the company filed yesterday, it will continue to provide vital rail services during the reorganization period. The court-appointed trustees will presumably still need substantial Federal help.

In the current uncertain economic climate, no one can say for sure what the impact of the bankruptcy of so large a corpora-

tion will be. The Administration's original aid plan was obviously aimed at preventing damage to Penn Central's suppliers and customers as well as to its stockholders.

A large part of the company's trouble stemmed from its own mismanagement. There is no guarantee that a new management will be any better, but a change was clearly in order. Even with the best of management, however, the Government will have to take a number of other steps if it wants to keep other railroads from going the way of the Penn Central.

The first step involves the railroads' abysmal labor relations. Earlier this year the Administration proposed a major overhaul of the Railway Labor Act, whose complex provisions in recent years have done little to promote labor peace.

Perhaps some of the provisions of the overhaul are arguable, but Congress has seemed to prefer to try to forget the whole matter. Yet the problem simply will not go away. The many railroad unions are coming in for new contracts all the time, and any dispute carries the real danger of a national rail shutdown.

The Administration also has proposed a corporation to take over vital rail passenger service, most of which is a money-losing proposition for the railroads. For months before the Penn Central crisis came to a head, the company had been trying to discontinue most of its long-haul passenger service.

It's pretty pointless to argue now over who or what should be blamed for the rail passenger troubles; there's plenty of blame to go around. Rail management deserves a share, along with the growing availability of highway and airline alternatives.

At the moment the fact is that the nation does need some rail passenger trains; they're still the most economical means of transporting large numbers of people from place to place. Someone must do a careful, conscientious job of deciding what service is really essential, giving no weight to such matters as local civic pride and the pleas of rail buffs, some of whom haven't ridden long-distance passenger trains in years.

A Federally sponsored system is an imperfect answer, especially with no more funds than appear to be available. But it's no answer, either, to expect the railroads to go on subsidizing passenger service with other earnings which, as in Penn Central's case, may disappear.

If the Government should do more in the passenger area, it also should do less in freight. Nearly a decade ago President John F. Kennedy proposed a major relaxation of railroad freight rate regulation, but the idea was side-tracked by opposition from barge lines and other rail competitors.

The opponents of greater rate freedom still argue that railroads hold vast monopolistic power that must be curbed by the rate-fixing activities of the Interstate Commerce Commission. That notion seems especially silly in the light of the current troubles of the Penn Central. In any case, the anti-trust statutes should suffice to curb any railroad that did manage to act monopolistically.

Emergency financial aid to the Penn Central could, as some of the critics claim, set a precedent for similar help in even more questionable cases. For that reason it's probably more desirable to set up more systematic procedures to consider requests for aid, as Senator William Proxmire urged last week.

Helping out the Penn Central or any other large corporation, moreover, fuzzes the line between private and public enterprise. If, in the case of the railroads, the nation wants to avoid obliterating the line altogether, it's going to have to launch a broader attack on the problems than it has up to now.

And the solution to those problems requires much more than loan guarantees.

[From the Washington Post, June 16, 1970]

#### KEYSERLING ON THE PENN CENTRAL

How right is your editorial of June 12, observing that the current Penn Central Railroad situation must "stimulate second thinking about the efficiency of mergers." The erroneous public decisions which approved this merger should prompt further consideration of the public interest, before a government which "cannot afford" to help adequately our public schools pump about 200 million dollars into helping a 7 billion dollar corporation (which owns a tremendously costly new luxury resort at Boca Raton) to continue its wrongful course.

For several years beginning in 1961, I opposed the Penn Central merger before the ICC. I said that the alleged financial crisis of the two roads, while serious, was grossly exaggerated and accompanied by some legerdemain; that this financial trouble was due predominantly to bad management and could be rectified only by improved management and an about-face in railroad policy; that the so-called financial crisis was caused largely by the high sensitivity of rail traffic to economic stagnation and recession 1953-1960, and would be alleviated by an acceptable rate of economic growth (note such effects 1960-1966, and the converse 1966 to date); that the claim that the merger would rescue "weaker" roads, such as the New Haven, was star-gazing; that the merger was deliberately contrived to achieve spurious "savings" by drastic curtailment of service rather than to achieve the efficiencies and enlarged service which might justify a mammoth merger; and that approval of the merger would propitiate the very mistakes just listed.

The ICC approved the merger, accepting as gospel the findings of the two roads and their independent experts, even though, as of the date of approval, these findings had been discredited completely by actual events. So today, Penn Central is "broke"; management is discredited; passenger service is being ruinously suspended.

When the case first went to the Supreme Court, where I again appeared in opposition to the merger, the Court by a 5 to 4 vote sent the case back to the ICC for further consideration of the prime legislative standard of adequacy of service. But when the case came back to the Court, the merger was unanimously approved in an opinion so concerned about whether several contending railroads got a fair break that it barely dealt with the paramount issue of adequate service. Indeed, the Court could not have faced this issue and approved the merger, for the ICC's attention to this issue was fragmentary and farcical.

Today, the public interest needs champions. When I opposed the merger before the ICC, it was also opposed by the Department of Justice in a 288-page brief, the Council of Economics Advisers, an interdepartmental committee established by President Kennedy, the Railway Labor Executives Association, and in part by the Port of New York Authority. But finally before the Supreme Court, all this opposition changed to support, even though the financial condition of the roads had greatly improved. A book examining this great sea-change would provide a rare story of weakness and, in some instances, venality.

LEON H. KEYSERLING.

WASHINGTON.

[From the New York Times, June 23, 1970]

#### BANKRUPT PENN CENTRAL

The reorganization of the Penn Central under the bankruptcy laws is an astonishing denouncement to the high hopes for improved service and financial strength stirred by the merger of two giant railroad systems just a little over two years ago. That this corporation with nearly \$7 billion in assets

should have to confess in Federal court its inability to pay its bills projects on a mammoth screen the dimensions of the liquidity crisis caused for many businesses by the current combination of inflation and recession.

Despite the shock of the Penn Central's forced bankruptcy, it is hard to find fault with the Congressional critics whose opposition obliged the Administration to back away from its plan to guarantee up to \$200 million in short-term bank loans to the rail complex. Quite apart from the appropriateness of such a commitment under the Defense Protection Act, there was scant basis for certainty that the need for Federal underwriting would end with the initial guarantee.

The appointment of trustees under Section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act will give the Penn Central a new lease on life by relieving it of its immediate obligation to pay taxes and other fixed charges as they fall due, but the experience of the New Haven makes it plain that reorganization is no panacea for an ailing railroad. Even at best, it could be twenty years before the Penn Central emerges from court supervision. For lawyers, the process will prove a guaranteed full employment program involving huge fees.

The suspension of the railroad's tax payments to states, cities and counties will aggravate local fiscal problems, already made acute by the inadequacy of aid from Washington. To that loss is added the necessity for state action of the kind now being taken by New York's Governor Rockefeller to help bolster Penn Central commuter service in metropolitan areas.

For all the woes attendant on reorganization in bankruptcy, it will keep the railroad intact and operating under court protection. If that proves insufficient, the Government may yet have to consider nationalizing a system that operates an eighth of all the country's trackage. The lines between public and private enterprise are growing increasingly cloudy in many fields, but it would make little sense to pretend that the Penn Central or other shaky roads were functioning as private corporations if the only way they could keep running was through endless infusions of Government cash.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer,  
June 19, 1970]

#### RAIL LOAN RAISES QUESTIONS

Rep. Wright Patman, D-Tex., is a controversial legislator in financial matters but he is right to ask about the federal government's guarantee of a \$200 million loan to Penn Central Transportation Co. He wants to know more facts and he wants to know who will play watchdog over the Defense Department's largesse.

Since it could be the public's money involved, the public—as well as Congress—is entitled to know all the answers. This is especially true in view of the following:

Penn Central's terrible money plight surprised even Wall Street which had heard rumblings of the railroad's trouble but didn't dream it was so serious.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has before it the proposed merger of Chesapeake & Ohio and Norfolk & Western railroads into a second eastern rail giant. How will Penn Central's flop affect the ICC's decision which already has been postponed?

If Penn Central is "balled out" on the grounds it is a service essential to the national security, how far will this practice go? Where will the line be drawn? How much will the government, through the Defense Department and Department of Transportation, influence the operation of Penn Central or other industries of services it might rescue?

If the questions seem endless, it might be because this really is the first time the federal government has invested in railroad operation to any degree, even though for several years the roads have been crying for help because

of passenger service deficits. The initial loan to Penn Central might well be only the start of several such bolstering actions.

The size of Penn Central made it imperative that the railroad be propped up financially in the interest of national transportation and of the national economy.

Behind all this is amazement that the Penn Central, merged as recently as 1968 under glorious promises of greater service and greater savings, could have come so swiftly on evil days.

It has been reported that the management, now removed, used revenues for diversification of holdings rather than plowing back the money into the railroad. When passenger losses mounted and freight profits didn't materialize as expected, Penn Central was in trouble.

In view of that history, Rep. Patman's inquiry seems justified.

#### IS DEMOCRACY DYING?

(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, Dr. Lynn W. Turner, a graduate of Indiana Central College and recipient of a master's degree from Indiana University and a Ph. D. degree from Harvard, recently announced his retirement as president of Otterbein College. Dr. Turner also holds two honorary degrees and is listed in Who's Who in America.

Upon his retirement, Dr. Turner delivered the commencement address to the class of 1970 at Otterbein which I am pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### IS DEMOCRACY DYING?

(By President Lynn W. Turner)

I want to talk today, very earnestly and soberly, about a phenomenon of our times, that troubles me more than anything I've seen in America for many, many years. This is not the issue of war and peace, or the civil rights movement, or the pollution of our native earth or any of the other crusades which young people mount against the "Establishment" nowadays, although I suspect that my personal zeal for most of these causes is not much less than yours. My deepest concern is not with these issues themselves, but with the methods being employed to bring them into focus. My concern is that your generation and mine, in your eagerness to reform and our reaction against your attempts to reform, are threatening the very existence of Democracy.

Democracy is at best a delicate growth for it cannot exist without the restraint and control of what seems to be one of mankind's most fundamental instincts, the instinct toward violence. Democracy is essentially an orderly process for the achievement of the will of the majority without violating the rights of minorities. Democracy is not revolution—revolutions are not democratic. Revolution is the imposition of the will of a minority by violent means on a resistant or passive majority. Even the American Revolution was a violent political takeover engineered by approximately 1/3 of the population of the 13 colonies against the wishes of the other 2/3.

Fortunately, in our case, the majority of Americans, resisting movements toward monarchy on the one hand and anarchy on the other, took control of the revolutionary movement after it had achieved independence and employed it in constructing the most successful democracy that the world has ever seen. Our English ancestors, without revolutionary violence, have arrived at

a similar condition—a nation in which sophisticated machinery for peaceful change has been well developed. Only a few other countries have achieved similar democratic, political stability—most of mankind is still ruled by force rather than reason. Democracy, which provides for the necessary elements of government, while maintaining at the same time a technique for peaceful change, is one of mankind's most superb achievements, comparable in every way to the exploration of the moon, the conquest of disease or the development of an eloquent literature. If democracy dies at our hands during this generation, it will be the greatest tragedy in the 20th century.

If I interpret what I read correctly, however, there is a substantial part of your generation and even a considerable portion of the generation between yours and mine which would totally disagree with the idea that there would be anything tragic about the death of democracy. Some of these individuals openly and stridently proclaim the doctrine that democracy must be overthrown. This idea of revolution has become so pervasive in university circles that it has captured the passions not only of students but of many faculty as well. This, to me, is an incomprehensible development. For here we see men and women who were supposed to have been trained to think objectively, to research a problem thoroughly before they came to conclusions about it, to debate it with scientific detachment and calm deliberation and to seek victory for their opinions in the free marketplace of ideas rather than in mob violence or emotional orgies—we see such people abandoning all of this training and becoming revolutionary anarchists.

What alarms me as much as the attacks by the young revolutionaries upon our democratic society is the growing tendency of conservatives to abandon democratic processes in defense of the status quo. This was even evident at the national convention of the American Historical Association this year and it has been increasingly apparent in our society as a whole. Conservative students are now organizing groups of various kinds to combat the radicals and are adopting vigilante tactics which may ultimately lead to civil war on our campuses. Construction workers in New York have recently taken to the streets in mobs to fight the young militants with their own weapons—fists, clubs, rocks, and it may even come finally to guns. If agitation on the left by the revolutionaries continues to rise, while repression on the right by police, soldiers and vigilante groups continues to match it, this country will soon be ripe for a fascist dictatorship. "In 1972, George Wallace or someone probably far worse will sweep the country with a hate campaign that will make 1968 look like a Sunday School picnic." (Senator Marg. Chase Smith from Maine.)

Someone has said that those who refuse to learn from the mistakes of the past will be condemned to repeat them. The leftist agitators in this country today lack many things, but their most tragic defect is the lack of a sense of history. Here is one instance in which it is a misfortune to be young, for our campus militants of the 60's have missed the sobering experience of having lived through the 20's and 30's. Those of us who witnessed personally the rise of Mussolini, Stalin and Hitler had vivid lessons in the breakdown of democracy. In nearly every instance, totalitarian dictatorship emerged as the end product of a classical pattern. This was especially true in Italy and Germany, where a costly and futile war, followed by depression and inflation, developed in the common people a profound sense of discouragement over what seemed to be the inadequacies of their elected rulers.

Democracy was assailed and threatened by communists and socialists of every description whose avowed purpose was to reform

society by first destroying it. Most of the people in these countries, sensing a profound threat to their own welfare and liberties from these revolutionists, turned for salvation to a messianic pseudo-socialist who actually enjoyed the support of the big business interests and even of many intellectuals. With this kind of backing both Mussolini and Hitler were able to seize power, dissolve the parliaments that existed in their countries, completely suppressed individual freedom, persecute and even exterminate minorities, and launch their countries upon ill-fated programs of conquest which led to a world war and untold suffering for millions of people. It would be particularly instructive for the young blacks in this country to study the history of Hitler's Nazi dictatorship in Germany. A part of his demonic program was to use the Jews in Germany as the scapegoats for all of the frustrations that the nation suffered. The German Jews were humiliated, persecuted and ultimately, together with Jews from all the parts of Europe conquered by Hitler, murdered. I would advise my young black friends to study this period of history and then ask themselves, "Who would be the people most likely to become the scapegoats for an American totalitarian dictator?" Must we forever repeat the mistakes of history? Must we follow again blindly the pattern of democratic dissolution, the threat of revolution and the establishment of dictatorship?

I not only witnessed these events as they occurred but I was personally involved in them for, contrary to what you may think, you are not the first generation of college students to notice the great events transpiring beyond the campus. During the 30's while the people in Italy and Germany were surrendering their liberties to a dictator, the people in the democratic nations of the world suffered from a strange kind of paralysis of the will which seemed not only to blind them to what was happening in Europe but even induced a certain degree of admiration for such characters as Mussolini and Hitler. (Not essentially different from the worship of Che Guevara and Mao Tse Tung which prevails in the more misguided circles of American youth today.) Above all there was a revolution against war as an instrument of national policy and a sort of blind feeling that World War II would never come if enough good democrats just decided to ignore it. There were organized movements similar to the "hell, no, we won't go" groups that now chant their rituals in American streets.

One of the things that Hitler was demanding in those days was the return of Danzig to Germany—a demand which Poland resisted. Since France had a treaty of alliance with Poland which might very well lead her into a war with Germany, it became fashionable in the 30's for young French intellectuals to shout "I'll not die for Danzig." Students at Oxford University signed pledges that they would never under any circumstances fight in any future war, and this idea spread into most of the universities and colleges throughout the English speaking world. American students gave this movement, a facetious twist—some of them organized the Veterans of Future Wars and petitioned Congress for immediate payment of their veterans' benefits,—a clever, but financially impossible idea. I happened to be a graduate student at Indiana University at the time and President of the International Relations Club. Although it had always been the purpose of this organization to study international affairs rather than try to influence them, we succumbed to the prevailing notion that passing resolutions, signing pledges and participating in demonstrations would prevent the oncoming of World War II. And so we organized a campaign to secure pledges against participation in any future war, we passed resolutions denouncing the ROTC on

the Indiana University Campus, about which incidentally, we knew nothing, and we generally felt very self-satisfied about the struggle that we were waging for peace. I realize that I am sounding cynical but my cynicism is not directed at peace itself or at the idealism of young people who want peace to prevail in the world. I am being cynical about the utter stupidity and futility of what we were trying to do to achieve it. The threats to peace in the 1930's were not the ROTC or American foreign policy or big business, but the mad ambitions of Benito Mussolini, Adolph Hitler and the war lords of Japan, and nothing that we did in Bloomington, Indiana or that the young men did at Oxford University had the slightest effect on these monsters except perhaps to encourage them. If it had any effect on our own government it was to paralyze it still further in the face of the rising threats of fascism.

The democracies stood by helplessly while Japan seized Manchuria and invaded the Chinese mainland, while Italy attacked and occupied Ethiopia, while Franco overthrew the republican government of Spain and while Hitler remilitarized the Rhineland, occupied Danzig, took over Austria and threatened Czechoslovakia. At this point the European democracies, England and France, made feeble protests and suggested that at least there ought to be an international conference before Hitler moved any further. The result was perhaps the most ghastrly surrender to the arrogant threat of force in all history—the Munich conference of 1938, at which France and England agreed to permit the occupation of all of the border territories in Czechoslovakia by Germany and Hungary, and from which Chamberlain returned to London waving a copy of the treaty in his hand and pronouncing to the crowd at the airport "I bring back peace in our time." Only six months later, Hitler callously shattered this treaty by occupying all of Czechoslovakia and a few months after that, he was making the same kind of threats against Poland. With hesitation and reluctance, even at this point, the English and French nations came to the grim realization that there was no way to deal with Hitler except by force, and they declared war on Germany.

I must confess that I went through, personally somewhat the same kind of illusion and disillusionment that Neville Chamberlain experienced. I found excuses that at least half way justified in my mind the things Hitler was doing during the early part of his career. Most of this excuse-making grew out of my own sense of historical guilt, out of my knowledge of the fact that the allies had imposed a grossly unjust treaty of peace upon the Germans in 1919 and that the economic policies of our own government had been largely responsible for the despair in Europe out of which Hitler had gained his strength. It is for these same reasons, this sense of guilt, that so many of us yield to the exorbitant demands of intransigent black students on our campuses today and indulge all of our young people in the total lack of discipline which we feel somehow is in absolute for our own shortcomings. There is nothing to be gained in the long run by this kind of cop-out.

The simple fact is, that in the face of the monstrous tyranny that had destroyed any vestige of freedom in half of Europe by 1939, and threatened to end the independence of Poland and drive the world into slavery, my college-boy infatuation with immediate peace, attained by denial of responsibility, faded away very rapidly. I had also achieved, I'm sure, a considerably greater degree of maturity in 1939 than I'd had in 1929. I had married, I had a daughter, I had entered upon the practice of my profession, I had built a house and mortgaged it, I owned an automobile. In the language cur-

rent today I suppose you would say that I had gone over to the Establishment—I prefer to express it as entering the age of responsibility. A family and a mortgage makes a lot of difference in your outlook. For one thing, you have something concrete to defend, rather than a lot of abstractions to attack.

In short, when we were drawn into World War II against Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo, I was fully committed to it—as was the rest of my generation—and we were happily relieved that our campaigns against the ROTC and the "merchants of death," back in the thirties, hadn't been successful, after all. Nor was my commitment irrelevant, for I was still registered with Selective Service, and actually applied for a naval commission in 1942. I'm telling you all this, not to give you a preview of my memoirs, but to try to make three points of importance to you—1) you are not the first young people who have gone through an age of trauma and distrust of your elders, 2) your attitudes will change as you take on responsibilities and you'll be glad that they do, 3) if you destroy the present because it hasn't repudiated the past, there will be no future.

Whatever your present attitude toward Otterbein College and the rest of the world may be, you're soon going to become members of the Establishment. Most of you are accepting jobs which exist only because of the Establishment. Some of you are going on to school supported by fellowships, assistantships and loans set up by the Establishment. Most of you will very soon enter into the oldest Establishment of all—marriage. You will shave off your beards, trim your curly locks, throw away your beads and get with it again. But be of good cheer, the world of which you have been a part, willy-nilly, for the last two decades, isn't so bad after all. As a Professor of History at the University of Montana recently wrote, in answer to some of the wild criticisms of his students, "Every generation makes its mistakes and we have made our share. But my generation has also made America the most affluent country on earth. It has tackled, head on, a racial problem as no nation in history had dared to do. It has publicly declared war on poverty, and it has gone to the moon; it has desegregated schools and abolished polio; it has presided over the beginning of what is probably the greatest social and economic revolution in history. It has declared itself, and committed itself, and taxed itself, and nearly run itself into the ground, in the cause of social justice and reform.

"Society, the 'Establishment,' is not a foreign thing we seek to impose on the young. It—along with the 18-year-old—is the product of thousands of years of the development of mankind. We know it is far from perfect. We did not make it; we have only sought to change it. We win, if we win at all, slowly and painfully." The fact that we have been partially successful in reaching our dreams is the story of all generations—as it will be the story of yours.

I urge you seniors, in the years to come, to enter a crusade for the preservation of Democracy—not with slogans, demonstrations, strikes, street riots, police battles, or constant harassment of public officials—you cannot save anything with a preservative that destroys it. Crusade with concern and commitment. Whatever your jobs or professions may be, involve yourselves actively and deeply with government and the structure of society. Become active in politics. Become one of Nader's Raiders, or one of McCarthy's White Knights, or maybe just one of State Representative Allan Norris' precinct workers, but make Democracy work! Repudiate fascist or communist tactics, not only in your political allegiances, but in your daily work, in your church, in your school system, in your recreations.

And when you become alumni, as you soon will, help keep democracy working at Otterbein College by your continued interest in and support of its processes. *During the two years of your upper class life at Otterbein we have worked out, through democratic procedures, a new plan of governance for the campus in which the students who succeed you will have a larger share in decision-making than almost anywhere else in the world of higher education.* A few of you have been very active in formulating this plan. All of you, I hope, voted for it. You will not be here to see it go into action next September, but you will surely be keenly interested in watching it, and, as alumni, influencing its future development. Alumni have a great deal to do with shaping the development of their *alma mater*. If they are too wedded to the school exactly as it was when they left it, they hang like a dead albatross around the neck of progress. If they are too critical, too negative, too indifferent, too deprecatory, too contemptuous of the college's ideals, they harbor a spirit of intellectual matricide, which injures both their *alma mater* and themselves.

You have been good students. You have been inquisitive and responsible. You have lived through a very critical period in the history of education with peacefulness and poise. You resisted the temptation to become revolutionaries because so many others were. You have participated in one of the greatest periods of constructive change in Otterbein's history. I am sure that you have learned your lessons well, and that so far as you are concerned, government—in the country, the schools and the cities—of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

#### SOCIETY IS NOT SICK

(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, these days when all we hear about is the vocal minority among students, I thought it would be refreshing and heartening to hear from the other side for a change. Therefore, I am happy to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the valedictorian address of Mr. Shawn Rader, a recent graduate of a Columbus, Ohio, high school. Shawn is the nephew of Earl R. Rader, a professor in the Department of Dairy Science at the Ohio State University. The address is as follows:

#### SOCIETY IS NOT SICK

Your Excellency Bishop Elwell, Monsignor Applegate, Father Handley, Father White, Members of the faculty, parents, relatives, friends, and fellow graduates, we have heard a great deal lately from a vocal minority of those who have passed a few years before us, and now are students in our Nation's colleges and universities. They call upon us to join them in their violent overthrow of a system they claim is unchangeable. This vocal minority calls upon us to join them in their scorn and rejection of the generation of our parents and our teachers. Our parents and teachers have been swallowed up by lives of materialism, they say, and have been content with "making it" while forgetting the real values of life—love, peace, and brotherhood. They say that our parents and teachers have dumped upon us a society of war, poverty, injustice and racism. Though some are truly working for change within our democratic system, many have only their own interests at heart. We must recognize these for what they really

are: egotistical and self-righteous. Let us ask ourselves why their insistence on universal love seems so often to express itself in hate for those who differ with them. Let us examine now the charges they make, and decide what our future course of action should be.

I think we have a lot to learn from the generation of our parents and teachers, born in the aftermath of one great conflict, reared in history's greatest depression, and graduated in time to fight man's grisliest war. They had but one thing in mind, fellow students, they wanted better for us, and they got it.

In the society of 30 years ago, a Negro lynching made the news only if it was public. Blacks came to the back door, worked for 50 cents a day. Today the blackman votes; shares schools and parks; is prominent in business, entertainment and politics. If we can make as much progress toward racial equality in the next 20 years as our parents' generation has in the last 20, we should be able to solve the racial problem.

As for the charge of a society of poverty . . . our parents and teachers can remember when the fear of hunger was in every home, when 20% of the men were jobless, when President Roosevelt cried that 1/3 of our Nation was ill-housed, ill-clothed, and ill-fed, and knew he wasn't exaggerating. Radicals cry economic injustice. . . . Our parents and teachers can remember when children worked in sweatshops, when miners attempting to organize were shot down; they remember the county poorhouse and the hell of the insane asylum.

The important thing for us to realize when faced with these facts, which some college students conveniently overlook, is that the failings of the past don't justify those of today, but that a realistic comparison reveals a continuing progress which is not a sign of a sick society.

Radicals today tell us that the generation of our parents and teachers is greedy, and possession-mad. We know better. Never has a people given more charitably of its blood, effort, or material. Our parents' generation fought history's worst war to save the world from the most barbaric of tyrannies, and then gave their wealth to friend and foe alike, to help rebuild a new and hopefully better world. There is no parallel in the history of mankind for such an act of generosity. And today, our nation taxes itself heavier than ever before to assist its poor, its aged, and its disabled.

Now let us examine the charge of materialism. Well, as John Pearce said in an article of the June 15, 1969 issue of the Louisville Courier-Journal, speaking to us for our parents' generation:

"We have been materialistic because we have seen too many people suffer too much from material want, because we remember too many starving children because we have walked too many miles through too many cold mornings to work long hours at low pay and return home at night to parents with fear and worry in their eyes. We determined it should not happen to you . . ."

Due to their determination, we are going to live longer, be sick less often, work fewer hours, and have a chance to spend the days of our lives in purposeful pursuits.

We are asked more than anything else today to join the college new left in their condemnation of the mortal sin of our parents' generation—Viet Nam. The fact that your consecutive presidents of both parties have seen the stakes there as high enough to warrant our involvement, seems to me to be deserving of consideration. I do not believe, as leftists charge, that we remain in Southeast Asia out of pride or for profit. I believe that we are there to give people the right to choose their government without

external or externally supported pressure. Furthermore, it seems rather strange to me, that our intervention in the Dominican Republic to uphold the elected government there met with little campus outcry. Could that be because a large increase in the draft was not necessitated? If so, we must remember that moral conviction should not wax and wane with the degree of personal sacrifice involved.

We should now be able to see that the Democratic system which has been passed to us by six generations is indeed accommodating to change. Our teachers and parents' generation in my opinion, has given us a fine example of responsible and intelligent use of it.

We have had good moral training here at Hartley, and have received an admirable set of Christian values. We have been taught respect for orderly change; I know of no teaching here that endorsed the burning of buildings or rioting to make a point.

This then would be my message to you my fellow graduates: much constructive change is still needed in our American society; we will be the ones to initiate that change. But let us initiate that change while adhering to our nation's constitution and the Christian values we have gained here. Let us follow the example of our teachers and parents' generation in that regard, for in this way, we will be a credit to our generation and a defender of our national heritage.

#### PRESIDENT'S VETO OF HOSPITAL FUNDS MUST BE OVERRIDDEN

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked at the action of the President in vetoing the 3-year extension of the Hill-Burton hospital and construction and modernization program. The President's justification for this veto, as with his veto of the education appropriation some months ago, is that the amounts appropriated by the Congress are "financially irresponsible."

The problem of obtaining adequate health care, especially if hospitalization is required, is acute in my district as it is in many other urban and rural areas throughout the country. Many of my constituents must wait for months for needed hospital care due to serious overcrowding and lack of facilities. This situation is made even more serious by the shortage of emergency and outpatient facilities in New York City. I receive frequent reports from frustrated city residents who complain of having to wait hours for attention in the emergency units of nearby hospitals.

As the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce indicated when it reported the Hill-Burton legislation to the House in 1969, there is a tremendous backlog of applications for Federal assistance to modernize, expand, and improve existing hospital facilities, and construct new ones. With that in mind, the House passed this legislation by a roll call vote of 351 to 0, and the Senate passed a more nearly adequate version by a vote of 79 to 0.

Mr. Speaker, for a quarter century, the Hill-Burton program has been the major stimulus to the development of hospital and other medical care facilities

ties. The President, in his budget message, proposed a total termination of this most crucial program. Now he says he will approve a "financially responsible" bill. In my view, it would be irresponsible for the Congress to accept legislation containing less than the rock-bottom \$1.2 billion provided in the bill the President has vetoed. This House, and the Senate, should override this deplorable veto by repeating the unanimous votes by which they passed the bill originally.

#### TEXAS OIL ALLOWABLES

(Mr. BUSH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, on June 22 the Wall Street Journal carried a story in which a "high Nixon administration official complained that a recent cut in Texas oil allowables was inflationary."

This is uninformed criticism at it worst.

There are several relevant factors.

First, crude oil prices have gone up less than prices on other commodities.

Second, the Texas Railroad Commission that sets allowables is not a price fixing body. It is a conservation body. It deals with ratable take. It permits all oil to be produced that can be used.

Oil in storage is building up—it is at a high point. The companies are selling all they can. What would this anonymous spokesman have the authorities do with the excess oil—the oil that is in storage. This oil that is in storage is not going to move by producing higher amounts of oil.

Third, there is a giant misconception about allowables, proration, nominations, ratable take, and so forth.

The Railroad Commission is not a price fixing body.

Nominations are made to the Commission saying how much oil the buyers can handle. The Commission then sees that the salable oil is ratably taken. This guarantees that there will be fair producing practices.

The Commission has an important conservation function. It sets rates of production which guarantee that funds will be produced at efficient rates.

Fourth, there is a tremendous misconception about the ability of fields to produce. Some uninformed critics assume that if the statewide allowable is set at 55 percent that that means 45 percent of available production is being withheld from the market. That simply is not true.

There is very little excess producing capacity in this country. The sooner we realize this the better off we are going to be from a national security point of view.

I have not been able to find out who the unnamed official is who charged the allowable setting as being inflationary. The kindest thing that can be said is that he is misinformed.

I am chairman of the GOP Task Force on Earth Resources and Population. We have just concluded hearings which demonstrate that we have a critical gas

shortage in this country, and that we are becoming increasingly dependent on foreign sources of oil.

Uninformed criticism which could lead to action making this country even more dependent on unreliable sources of foreign oil does not help a thing.

No one in his right mind would decree we should increase our dependency on Middle East oil today—yet that could be the result of this type of criticism.

Something needs to be done to educate the critics.

In a speech given May 4, Hendrik S. Houthakker, a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, states:

In Texas, oil production is now being reduced by 36½ percent below what could be produced economically.

This is not true today with lower allowables and it was even less true when Dr. Houthakker made his speech. It is just plain factually incorrect. In fairness to him, I believe Dr. Houthakker now knows that is incorrect. He has told me this.

Today I have written Dr. McCracken suggesting that he and the other two members of the Council of Economic Advisers hold a meeting with two or three experts who understand the function of the State regulatory bodies.

I am convinced that the Council, presented with hard facts, will soon see that the "ratable take" function of the Texas Railroad Commission is not a price fixing scheme, nor a protection scheme; rather, it is a procedure to guarantee all fields a fair part of the market. It protects the little man and it protects the national interest through sound conservation.

If this anonymous critic resides within the Council of Economic Advisers, he will learn by this meeting the errors of his ways. If he does not, the meeting will still be productive, because what we need on this subject is understanding, and then leadership.

It is essential that the President be given sound and informed advice since the oil so directly affects our national security.

#### DISPOSAL OF SEWAGE

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, because of our relationship to the District of Columbia, we in Congress have a special responsibility to assist in restoring the waters of the Potomac and its tributaries to purity.

Difficulties in resolving the problem of handling and disposing municipal sewage waste basically results from the lack of an overall realistic and fully coordinated plan developed by the jurisdictions comprising the metropolitan area. I would propose that the enforcement conference which is responsible for meeting water quality standards, call on the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments to develop such a long-range regional plan for treatment and disposal of sewage. The conferees should develop and agree upon an equitable

formula for financing such a study through COG.

The council of governments is composed of elected representatives of the various jurisdictions in the area, and would be an appropriate body to perform such a task. It already has the responsibility for developing regional sewer and water plans, but it must have more resources if it is to produce the type of comprehensive plan and address all issues involved. Such a plan should include treatment of the combined storm and sanitary sewage which exists in certain parts of the region, matching treatment facilities with expected loads and capability of the receiving body of water to absorb the treated effluent discharge from the treatment facilities.

For the immediate future until such a long range plan is formulated it is unreasonable to restrict the Blue Plains to any less than 309 million gallons a day.

The several jurisdictions involved have developed plans and facilities on the basis of assurance that Blue Plains would be available for expansion. To reverse such plans without the opportunity for the areas involved to develop the appropriate alternatives which would guarantee adequate treatment for the various streams involved would be unconscionable.

In light of the commitment to clean up our Nation's water the Congress of the United States on behalf of the District of Columbia and the local jurisdictions who will use Blue Plains should stand ready to support treatment to a high degree or tertiary level at Blue Plains. All jurisdictions which use Blue Plains have an obligation to upgrade the quality of the Potomac as a recreational and commercial resource for millions of citizens of our region.

In the development of a long range regional plan, all parties involved should take a long, hard look as to whether the concept of concentrating municipal waste in one treatment facility is the final answer.

With the continuing innovation and development of new technical knowledge which moves in the direction of economical and efficient recycling of water the ability to disperse small sewage treatment facilities may be a valuable tool in suburban planning.

The possibility of some dispersion of sewage treatment facilities to recycle and thereby return potable water to the streams could well preclude the dangers of suburban sprawl and improper growth which has sometimes resulted from vast trunk sewer developments in the past.

#### THE IMPACT OF THE PRESIDENT'S VETO ON HOSPITALS AND MEDICAL CARE CENTERS

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I spoke out on the crisis that the Nation faces in the field of medical education and manpower training and the un-

fortunate impact that the President's recent veto of badly needed construction moneys for hospital and medical care centers would have. Needless to say, I shall vote to override this veto.

As all Members know, this vital program passed the House just one and a half weeks ago by a vote of 377 to 0. I am somewhat gratified to note that a major newspaper, the Morning Sun in my city of Baltimore, took the occasion today to editorialize on the very subject of my remarks of yesterday. I commend to all the Members of the House this fine editorial on this most critical issue and include it in the RECORD at this point:

#### CRISIS IN HEALTH

Fredrick P. McGehan's articles in *The Sun* present a disturbing picture of the state of American medical education. Financially it is approaching the crisis point.

There is a pressing need for doctors and a "widening gap between supply and demand." Since 1966 medical schools have increased their enrollment capacity by 32 per cent. But spokesmen for the schools say funds have never been "sufficient" and now less and less money is available for construction, for operating costs, for research, for student grants. "Money" means, of course, federal funds; ever since World War II medical schools and the universities of which many of them are a part, have been more and more—and more helplessly—dependent on Washington's assistance. Now with the grim but necessary fight against inflation those funds are being cut back. Mr. McGehan notes that the Association of American Medical Colleges "reports that 61 medical schools—of a total of 107 in the nation—have been awarded special federal grants 'on the basis of some condition of financial distress.'" Even so the emergency is growing more acute.

The Johns Hopkins is a case in point. Mr. McGehan said in his article yesterday that the School of Medicine finds itself in the "worst shape" in its 77-year-old history. It faces a current deficit of around \$900,000, expects the next fiscal year to produce a shortage of more than \$2.3 million, and has lost \$1.5 in federal support in the past 12 months and \$440,000 in grants for post-doctoral support.

By cruelly ironic coincidence, a news story accompanying the article underlines the mounting difficulties of the squeeze. President Nixon has vetoed a three-year authorization of \$2.79 billion for health facilities because the bill in its present form would be "a long step down the road of fiscal irresponsibility." To halt inflation he must hold his budgetary line.

All of us are aware of the rising costs of Medicaid and Medicare, of hospital charges and health insurance, of medical education, tuition, salaries and research. The schools, with their reliance on federal help, are caught between the inflationary spiral and the government's obligation to curb it. But the need for doctors remains insistent and, as Mr. Nixon recognized in his veto statement, the nation's health must take high rank among all the competing "priorities."

Clearly there can be no magical and instant answers. Just as clearly, Washington, medical organizations and the schools must join in a coherent and urgent effort to find new ways of meeting a problem that has now taken on serious proportions.

#### INTERNATIONAL DAY OF BREAD AND HARVEST FESTIVAL

(Mr. SEBELIUS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, I am most proud to be a cosponsor of the joint resolution calling for the second "Annual Day of Bread" introduced by Congresswoman CATHERINE MAY of the State of Washington and Congressman GRAHAM PURCELL of the State of Texas.

I would like to point out, as I did last year when the Day of Bread and Harvest Festival Week first became a reality, that it is most fitting Congresswoman MAY and Congressman PURCELL have introduced this resolution. Certainly all of those connected with wheat industry are well aware of the many contributions my colleagues from Washington and Texas have made to the world's most important food industry—the wheat industry.

Mr. Speaker, the introduction of this resolution at this time is most appropriate because it comes at the same time as our farmers are harvesting this year's wheat crop. The harvest in our Nation's largest wheat producing State is now underway. The month of July is designated Kansas Wheat Month in my home State to honor this annual harvest.

Within the concept of this resolution, I am hopeful we can see the dawn of a new world of agriculture. Perhaps our Nation's greatest contribution to world peace is our ability and capacity to produce food and our willingness to share that knowledge and bounty with our neighbors and friends.

It becomes clear, considering the future race between world population and world food supply, we must make an all-out effort that calls for a new kind of agriculture—an international undertaking to combat hunger and modernize agriculture. This joint resolution, calling for the second annual observance of the Day of Bread, marks another cornerstone in that effort.

I commend Congresswoman MAY and Congressman PURCELL for their efforts in this regard. I consider it a privilege and honor to cosponsor this resolution. I urge my colleagues to approve this resolution for the observance of the second "Annual Day of Bread and Harvest Festival."

#### SPEAKER HONORED BY PRESIDENT NIXON, FORMER PRESIDENT JOHNSON

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on May 27 the President of the United States honored the Speaker of the House of Representatives for his great and devoted service to the United States. Many of us were fortunate enough to be present at that heartwarming event. For the benefit of those who were not I would like to place in the RECORD a transcript of remarks made by the President, former President Lyndon B. Johnson, and the great Speaker of the House, JOHN W. MCCORMACK. I now offer this transcript so that all Members of the House may, in effect, join in the recent event marking the approaching retirement of our beloved Speaker:

EXCHANGE OF REMARKS BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT, FORMER PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, AND JOHN W. MCCORMACK, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AT A LUNCHEON IN HONOR OF SPEAKER MCCORMACK

The President. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Chief Justice, all of the distinguished guests who are here for this occasion:

We wish that time permitted everyone here to say what he would like to say about The Speaker, and even under the rules of the House that might have been possible, because I figured it out that with approximately 100 of the elite—and you are the elite believe me; you should have seen the words I received from those who were not invited to this luncheon—but 100 of the elite are here, and each of you should speak, but even under the rules of the house, literally we would not be out of here until 4:00.

I have just been informed that the House Members have to get back a couple of votes and the Senate Members just have to get back.

But we do not want to keep either the House or the Senate from their very important responsibilities, so I have taken upon myself the very difficult choice of selecting those from this assemblage who would speak for all of us.

I naturally have turned to those who have known The Speaker the longest, those who served with him who are no longer in the House, and those who have served under him and with him who are presently in the House.

It will be bipartisan, of course, bipartisan because those who respect this Speaker are not numbered or certainly not designated by their party affiliation. We all cherish his friendship and that will be evident from the remarks you will hear.

So now under the rules of the House, which The Speaker will enforce, if I will not, each will be recognized.

(The President then introduced Congressman Howard Smith, Congressman Charles Halleck, Congressman Emanuel Celler and Congressman Leslie C. Arends for brief remarks.)

The President. Now we come to one who has served with The Speaker and one who has been intimately associated with him over many, many years and one who presided in this house with such great dignity and great courage immediately prior to the time I have had the privilege to be here.

I think we are very fortunate that President Johnson came all the way from Texas up here to honor The Speaker today.

President JOHNSON. Mr. President, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chief Justice, Members of the Congress and friends all:

First, Mr. President, with all the problems that you carry and all the burdens you bear, this is a most unusual and thoughtful thing for you to do, and on behalf of all my fellow men, I want to thank you especially for extending this courtesy to our beloved friend, John McCormack.

Secondly, I want to thank you for extending this courtesy to me and permitting me to come here and hear these tributes to John McCormack, and giving me a chance to express mine.

For almost 39 years I have known Speaker McCormack and he has been my friend. He and I have many things in common. Our wives are friends, true, good friends, and we both out-married ourselves.

Second, we both had the same teacher, served under and with the same Speaker, Sam Rayburn. He was a good teacher. He taught us many things. He never taught us to hate. He always taught us to love, and to love our colleagues on both sides of the aisle. He always taught us to respect our President, whoever was President.

He started out with Woodrow Wilson, but he used to tell us in the shadow of the day,

in the cool of the evening and in the Board of Education, how fond he was of President Coolidge and how he would come here and have scrambled eggs for breakfast, and how they talked together, not very much, but some.

I am not sure, Mr. President, which rule you are putting me under today. You said the House rule, but it has been so long since I served in the House, I remember there was a one-minute rule for extension and a five-minute rule for amendments, and I guess I violated both of them.

In any event, Mr. Rayburn taught us to respect our President and to help him whenever and wherever we could. John McCormack followed that lesson.

The last several months I have been sitting there on the banks of the little river that runs in front of my house, reading the minutes of the many meetings that I had as President. In some of those meetings, Speaker McCormack was, in effect, my Vice President. For many months we were without a Vice President. Most every important meeting that we had, certainly those we had with the Leadership, we had minutes on those meetings and we had shorthand transcripts on those meetings.

I don't know that they will ever be as interesting to anyone else as they are to me, but I have enjoyed them for the last 18 months. I particularly enjoyed reading what John McCormack had to say.

First of all, he was usually one of the first to speak. He always spoke frankly and candidly. He always spoke courteously and helpfully. I think that the historians of this period, when they recall what happened, they will point to this man, John McCormack, as a person who loved his country and as a person who gave his all to the President, whoever he may have been.

I was asked when I was a young man, by a University of Texas professor, to state my philosophy of government. I said first of all, I am very proud that I am a free man. Second, I am very proud that I am an American, and third, I am very happy to be a public servant and Member of the United States Senate, and fourth, I am proud to be a Democrat—all in that order.

I know that sometimes we don't do what we tried to do, and we don't realize our goals or ambitions, and often don't reach our objectives. But I have tried to keep in front of me always those cardinal rules: A free man, an American, a public servant and a member of my party, but in that order.

My observation of 39 years with John McCormack is that he has observed them in that order. He has fought and protected and nurtured freedom every time it was at stake. His love of country is unequalled. His competent, towering service in the body that he chose to serve in—he could have served in others—is unparalleled. No one can question his democracy and being a good Democrat. But it always came after being a free man, and an American and The Speaker.

Mr. McCormack, like Charlie Halleck, I don't think I could have walked all the way from Texas here, but I would have tried. I wanted to be here bad enough to have tried it. Fortunately, I did not have to, but I am so glad that I was asked.

I will hate to see the Congress with you no longer in that chair, because you have always given me comfort just knowing you were there behind me, but wherever you are, you will have my love and my respect.

The PRESIDENT. I have the privilege to make the presentation to The Speaker, a presentation which inevitably, as you will see, has the gavel, but which also has an inscription which I think summarizes some of the things that have been said so eloquently by those who have spoken before on this program.

In thinking of this moment, however, I believe it is well for all of us to realize that like so many moments in this great room, we are here on an occasion that never happened before, and probably will never happen again.

The Speaker has been honored, as a man and as an institution at dinners at the White House for many years. But this is the first occasion in which a Speaker who has been honored, has served longer, continually in that particular position than any Speaker in the whole history of the United States, and who next to Sam Rayburn, held the office of Speaker longer than any man in the history of the United States.

What a distinguished record that is. It is something that should be honored in this room, where last night we honored a President, and over the years, Kings and Queens and Emperors and various leaders in all walks of life.

I think President Johnson stated my sentiments very well, and perhaps it is not unexpected that our views about The Speaker would be somewhat the same because of the position that we held.

Perhaps I can put it this way: I asked The Speaker to submit a list of names to be included and he chose all of you, the ranking Members of the House and of the Senate, also some of the people in the Administration, the elected officials, the Chief Justice, very, very few people otherwise from family, Lew Deschler, without whom no Speaker could preside over that House—I don't think he could, at least.

It is also significant that The Speaker asked in addition to his present friends and colleagues and former friends, the former Secretary of State, Dean Acheson. I think I know the reason he wanted him here, because he was a friend, but also because The Speaker, based on my conversations with him over the years, and particularly over the past 16 months, speaks of those times when he spoke to President Roosevelt, President Truman, President Eisenhower, President Kennedy and President Johnson about domestic policies and also foreign policy.

He did not agree with all Presidents, even Presidents of his own party, completely. But in this area of foreign policy, he had an enormous interest, an enormous concern, and over and over again he has told of incidents in which there were foreign policy matters where he talked to the President and gave the President his views on what he, as a man and as a leader of his party, felt was best for the country.

I think that on this occasion, Republicans and Democrats can be very proud of the service The Speaker has rendered in that esteemed office that he has held. We can be proud of all his other characteristics that have been so eloquently described. We can be particularly proud of the fact that here is a man who meets the qualifications that President Johnson so eloquently described.

I will show you the plaque and then I will read the inscription and then propose the toast to The Speaker.

"Presented to John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, May 27, 1970."

My inscription: "He has been Speaker of the House of Representatives for a record number of consecutive years. His actions have always expressed unsurpassed devotion to country. When the lines are drawn on the great national issues, John McCormack stands not as a son of Massachusetts, not as the leader of a political party, but as an American."

To The Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, you are recognized under the rules of the Senate.

Speaker McCormack. Mr. President, President Johnson, Vice President Agnew, Your

Eminence, Cardinal O'Boyle, Mr. Chief Justice, my distinguished leadership and colleagues of both branches of the Congress of the United States, and other ladies and gentlemen who are present:

It is rather difficult for me to express the feelings that I am possessed of at this particular time, to be so honored by the President of the United States and the former President and all who are gathered here in this historic building which symbolizes the greatness of America of the past, the hopes and determination of the present and the future pathway of our country in connection with the future.

I am deeply touched by the remarks that have been made by those whom the President has called upon to speak. I shall always treasure them.

This building, the White House, is filled with history. If the walls could only speak. I have been a part of it, the atmosphere of this building, for so many years, in connection with the conferences that have taken place on the leadership level with every President since 1940 when I was first elected as Majority Leader of the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, in accepting this unusual remembrance, if I might call it such, which Mrs. McCormack and I will always treasure, I do so more in the name of the House of Representatives than I do as John McCormack.

I love the House of Representatives. I love the Congress of the United States. But I know my colleagues in the Senate, and many of them here served with me in the House of Representatives, will not think that I am in any way downgrading the Senate when I emphasize the fact that I love the House of Representatives.

So, I accept this as evidence on your part not only to me personally, but particularly in my capacity as Speaker of the National House of Representatives.

I have faith in men and women who want to be free under their own law. No matter how dark things might look, I have confidence. I view the future with confidence because of the faith that I have in men and women who want to be free, as I have just said, under their own law.

I might say, when the President invoked the House rules that I said to him, "Tell them it is a McCormack minute, they will understand." I am not going to violate the McCormack minute, which is usually two minutes to two and one-half. I let it go sometimes to three minutes. What do I care; if they have something they want to talk about, give them the opportunity to do so.

So I have a lot of flexibility in connection with determining what the 60 seconds constitute. The Speaker has the right of recognition, so that is one thing that he still has possession of, the right of recognition. I can interpret what a minute means in terms of seconds. But I am not going to violate the spirit and the atmosphere of the length of time in relation to remarks that I might make.

All I can say is that I am deeply indebted to you, Mr. President, I am deeply indebted to President Johnson for being here and showing your friendship, the best evidence of your friendship for me. I am deeply indebted to my colleagues in the House, first my Democratic colleagues in caucus, the first action necessary, and then the Members of the House as a whole in electing me for the continuous service that I have enjoyed, which constitutes the longest continuous service to date in the history of the country in connection with any Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I still have several months ahead of me and I want you to know that I am going

to be a working Speaker, that I am going to do everything I possibly can in the remaining period of this Session to have enacted into law legislation that I think is for the best interest of the people of our country and those matters and appropriations which concern the national interest of our country.

There are so many things that one could say on an occasion of this kind, that is, looking into the future. But I can assure my friends of one thing: I am not going to be inactive in retirement. That would be inconsistent with my thoughts, my temperament, as well as my desires.

I have served 42 years in the House of Representatives with the ending of this term, and I appreciate very much the confidence and the support the people of my district have given to me, as well as the confidence that I have enjoyed from the Members of the House of Representatives.

The remarks of Les Arends, Charley Halleck and others about my fairness as presiding officer touch me very much. As I said in the few remarks that I made on the Floor of the House from the rostrum yesterday when so many nice things were said about me, and I repeat here: I would rather be remembered as a Members' Speaker than any other title that could be bestowed upon me.

So, Mr. President, from the bottom of my heart I thank you for your thoughtfulness. I thank you for your generous remarks. I thank you for this beautiful presentation which will become an integral part of the McCormack family for all time and a part of history.

I am most grateful to President Johnson for being here as I have said before, and to all of you. I might say that throughout the years, ladies and gentlemen, and as President Johnson referred to, Sam Rayburn said so well: I have a feeling tantamount to reverence for the office of the President of the United States. It is the most powerful office in the world. The occupant of it has many painful moments. Oftentimes, and I remember well, President Johnson, your reference to the fact that I for a period of time, 14 months in fact, was next in line of succession. I might say I prayed every night for your health, your continued health, and that I would make my contributions toward the stability, the strength, the progress of our country, as I do now, and particularly be guided and directed in connection with making my contributions toward peace.

I love the House of Representatives. It is a part and parcel of my entire life. It will always be in my mind and in my system. I am deeply touched by this manifestation of friendship, not so much for John McCormack, the individual, but for the House of Representatives through this one who happens to be the Speaker.

Again, I am deeply indebted to the entire House for the many considerations and courtesies that they have extended to me.

Might I, ladies and gentlemen, ask you to rise? I offer a toast to a man who occupies the most powerful office in the world and in a free society, but at times the most lonely man in the world, when he has to make a momentous decision, because he is the one who has to do it, in his judgment, and in his conscience. Powerful, yes, trust from the people, but lonely when the important decisions are made: The President of the United States.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. MAHON submitted the following conference report on the bill (H.R. 17399) making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 91-1227)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17399) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 14, 23, 40, 41, 42, and 43.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 5, 7, 8, 11, 17, 18, 19, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, and 60, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$3,997,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$129,675"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$8,048,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$50,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,500,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20, 22, 24, 50, 51, and 62.

GEORGE MAHON,

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,

JOE L. EVINS,

WILLIAM H. NATCHER,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,

TOM STEED,

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,

CHARLES R. JONAS,

ELFORD CEDERBERG,

ROBERT H. MICHEL,

ODIN LANGEN,

#### Managers on the Part of the House.

ROBERT C. BYRD,

JOHN O. PASTORE,

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,

JOHN STENNIS,

ROMAN L. HRUSKA,

MILTON R. YOUNG,

MARGARET CHASE SMITH,

#### Managers on the Part of the Senate.

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17399) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

#### TITLE I

#### Chapter I—Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 1: Provides \$425,000 by transfer for "Extension Service, Cooperative extension work, payments, and expenses" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$597,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate provision of \$300,000,000 for the "Food Stamp program", with an amendment changing the date for the availability of such funds to cover a four instead of a three-month period of time. Funds so provided are to be charged to the amount provided in the 1971 bill for this purpose, when enacted. The \$300,000,000 does not necessarily have to be prorated over the four month period. These funds are required so that the food stamp program may be continued at about its current level pending enactment of authorizing legislation for the 1971 program, and the regular annual appropriation bill.

#### Chapter III—District of Columbia

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$3,997,000 for "Federal payment to the District of Columbia" instead of \$5,831,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$129,675 for "General operating expenses" instead of \$2,675 as proposed by the House and \$174,675 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$3,966,485 for "Public safety" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,370,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6: Deletes appropriation of \$1,789,000 for "Public safety" to assist in meeting costs associated with salary increases for policemen and firemen proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$171,750 for "Parks and recreation" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$47,300 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$20,000 for "Settlement of claims and suits" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$8,048,000 for "Capital outlay" instead of \$1,658,000 as proposed by the House and \$8,768,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment to provide that \$318,000 shall be available for construction services instead of \$374,500 as proposed by the Senate.

#### Chapter V—Independent offices

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$157,816,600 for "Payment to Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to appropriate \$371,000 for the General Services Administration for sites and expenses of a public buildings project at Aberdeen, Mississippi.

Amendment No. 13: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to insist on disagreement to the amendment of the Senate which proposes to appropriate an additional \$8,800,000 for the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1970.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$7,000,000 for the "Selective Service System" as proposed by the House instead of \$7,433,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate \$350,000 for the "Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental

Quality," instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House and \$400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Housing and Urban Development

Amendment No. 16: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to insist on disagreement to the amendment of the Senate which proposes to appropriate an additional \$587,500,000 for Urban Renewal Programs for fiscal year 1970.

Chapter VI—Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$225,000 for "Geological Survey, surveys, investigations, and research" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$775,000 for "National Park Service, Management and Protection" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$850,000 as proposed by the House.

Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates \$21,172,000 for "Forest Protection and Utilization, Forest Land Management" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$21,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with the Senate amendment which provides \$172,000 of funds appropriated for "Forest Land Management" shall remain available until expended.

Chapter VII—Department of Labor

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates \$50,000,000 for "Manpower development and training activities" instead of \$100,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to appropriate \$2,330,000 for "Trade Adjustment Activities."

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Amendment No. 23: Deletes item proposed by the Senate to appropriate \$8,703,078 for "Hospital Modernization and Construction".

Chapter VIII—Legislative Branch

Amendment No. 24: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to provide \$345,000 for "Contingent expenses of the Senate, inquiries and investigations" by transfer from another Senate account.

Chapter X—Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies

Department of Justice

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$500,000 for "Fees and expenses of witnesses" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates \$850,000 for "Support of United States prisoners" as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates \$145,000 for "State marine schools" as proposed by the Senate.

Related Agencies

Amendment No. 28: Inserts title as proposed by the Senate.

Chapter XI—Department of Transportation

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates \$1,000,000 for "Coast Guard, Retired Pay" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,250,000 as proposed by the House.

Chapter XII—Treasury Department

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates \$1,300,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Accounts" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates \$3,600,000 for the Bureau of the Public Debt for "Administering the public debt" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,250,000 as proposed by the House.

Post Office Department

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates \$10,600,000 for "Transportation" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$10,700,000 as proposed by the House.

Tax Court of the United States

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates \$67,000 for the Tax Court of the United States as proposed by the Senate instead of \$83,000 as proposed by the House.

Chapter XIII—Claims and judgments

Amendments Nos. 34 and 35: Appropriate \$23,478,461 for claims and judgments as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,591,406 as proposed by the House, including those in Senate Document Numbered 91-86.

TITLE II

Increased pay costs

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates \$4,495,874 for various Senate items as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$43,475, for "Joint Economic Committee" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$44,490 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates \$146,300 for "Senate office buildings" and \$3,400 for "Senate garage" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates \$502,500,000 for "Military personnel, Air Force" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$485,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates \$196,480,000 for "Operation and maintenance, Army" as proposed by the House instead of \$206,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates \$157,800,000 for "Operation and maintenance, Navy" as proposed by the House instead of \$166,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates \$70,400,000 for "Operations and maintenance, Defense agencies" as proposed by the House instead of \$74,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates \$13,800,000 for "Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard" as proposed by the House instead of \$14,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$3,681,000 for the National Park Service, "Management and protection", as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,359,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 45: Increase by \$55,000 the limitation on administrative expenses for the Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 46, 47 and 48: Make technical language changes to change the format of items as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates \$1,940,000 for "United States Secret Service" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,740,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 50: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment making \$200,000 for the U.S. Secret Service available upon enactment of H.R. 17138, or similar legislation, with an amendment changing the citation.

Amendment No. 51: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment providing \$42,000 by transfer for "Salaries and expenses" of the Appalachian Regional Commission to cover increased pay costs.

(Out of District of Columbia Funds)

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates \$2,229,000 for "General operating expenses" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,932,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates \$2,324,000 for "Public safety" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,780,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates \$899,000 for "Parks and recreation" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$652,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates \$4,624,000 for "Health and welfare" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,478,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 56: Appropriates \$1,905,000 for "Sanitary engineering" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,096,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 57, 58, 59, and 60: Provide that \$12,191,000 shall be paid from the general fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$10,332,000 as proposed by the House, \$535,000 shall be paid from the highway fund (regular) as proposed by the Senate instead of \$533,000 as proposed by the House; \$468,000 shall be paid from the water fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$375,000 as proposed by the House; and \$339,000 shall be paid from the sanitary sewage works fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$250,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE V

Limitation on fiscal year 1971 budget outlays

Amendment No. 61: In connection with the overall government ceiling on fiscal 1971 budget outlays (expenditures and net lending), the House bill contained a \$3,000,000,000 "cushion" for necessary expenditures beyond the estimates in the February 2 budget for certain designated uncontrollables (mainly interest on the debt, the various social insurance trust funds, and farm price supports). These are some of the items as to which the Congress is not required to act upon annually in the appropriations bills. The Senate raised this "cushion" for uncontrollable overruns to \$6,000,000,000. The conferees have agreed upon \$4,500,000,000.

TITLE VI

General provisions

Amendment No. 62: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment in order to validate obligations incurred between July 1, 1970, and 5 days following approval of the act.

GEORGE MAHON,  
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,  
JOE L. EVINS,  
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,  
DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
TOM STEED,  
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,  
CHARLES R. JONAS,  
ELFORD CEDERBERG,  
ROBERT H. MICHEL,  
ODIN LANGEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CAREY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the week of June 22, on account of family illness.

Mr. WATKINS, for June 25, on account of a personal obligation of 50 years standing.

Mr. FINDLEY, from June 27 to July 1, 1970, on account of official business to attend North Atlantic Assembly committee meetings.

Mr. ASPINALL, from 3 p.m., June 26, 1970, until July 14, 1970, on account of

official business from June 26 until July 10 and personal matters from July 10 to July 14.

Mr. WIGGINS (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for June 25 and the balance of the week on account of official business as a member of the House Committee on Crime conducting hearings in New York.

#### 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. COUGHLIN) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FINDLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. QUILLEN, for 3 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RANDALL) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. TUNNEY, for 15 minutes, on June 25.

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 20 minutes, on June 25.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ROBISON (at the request of Mr. RHODES) to extend his remarks after those of Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin.

Mr. MICHEL (at the request of Mr. RHODES) prior to the vote on the Hathaway amendment in the Committee of the Whole on H.R. 18127.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COUGHLIN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LANGEN.

Mr. CRAMER.

Mr. ROBISON.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. BRAY in three instances.

Mr. BUTTON in two instances.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. COLLIER in five instances.

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. SMITH of New York in two instances.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

Mr. WYATT.

Mr. MAILLIARD in two instances.

Mr. BUSH.

Mr. FOREMAN in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RANDALL) and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. COHELAN in five instances.

Mr. ALEXANDER.

Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.  
Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.  
Mr. RODINO in two instances.  
Mr. SISK in two instances.  
Mr. STOKES in four instances.  
Mr. MINISH.  
Mr. DINGELL in three instances.  
Mr. BINGHAM in four instances.  
Mr. SLACK.  
Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.  
Mr. BRADEMANS in six instances.  
Mr. HÉBERT.  
Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana in three instances.  
Mr. HARRINGTON.  
Mr. KOCH in two instances.  
Mr. FOUNTAIN in three instances.  
Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.  
Mr. O'HARA in two instances.  
Mr. ALBERT in two instances.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2209. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of North Dakota to the Central Dakota Nursing Home; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2583. An act to provide for the conveyance to the County of Washakie, State of Wyoming, of certain real property of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 743. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Touchet division, Walla Walla project, Oregon-Washington, and for other purposes;

S. 2062. An act to provide for the differentiation between private and public ownership of lands in the administration of the acreage limitation provisions of Federal reclamation law, and for other purposes; and

S. 2315. An act to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, and for other purposes.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 23, 1970, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 16298. To amend section 703(b) of title 10, United States Code, to extend the authority to grant a special thirty-day leave for members of the uniformed services who voluntarily extend their tours of duty in hostile fire areas; and

H.R. 17241. To continue until the close of June 30, 1972, the existing suspension of duties on certain forms of copper.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 25, 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:

2145. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting a report on the value of property, supplies and commodities provided by the Berlin Magistrat for the quarter January 1 to March 31, 1970, pursuant to the provisions of section 620 of the Defense Appropriation Act, 1970; to the Committee Appropriations.

2146. A letter from the chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, transmitting a report of the Board pursuant to section 9(c) of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1960, as amended; to the Committee on Internal Security.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 15913. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1225). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 1519 (Rept. No. 91-1226). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MAHON: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 17399 (Rept. No. 91-1227). Ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolution were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRAY (for himself, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. TEAGUE of California, and Mr. ARENDS):

H.R. 18189. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise, extend, and improve the program established by title VI of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 18190. A bill to amend section 1372 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to passive investment income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 18191. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to encourage the development and utilization of new and improved methods of waste disposal and pollution control; to assist small business concerns to effect conversions required to meet Federal or State pollution control standards; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 18192. A bill to authorize a survey of the Saline River, Ill., in the interest of navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 18193. A bill to establish a Department of Education and Manpower; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 18194. A bill to revise and clarify the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 18195. A bill to amend section 4182 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIZELL:

H.R. 18196. A bill to authorize the lease and transfer of Burley tobacco acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 18197. 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. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MIKVA, and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H.R. 18198. 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; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. REES, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. TUNNEY, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 18199. 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; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SPRINGER (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, and Mr. BUSH):

H.R. 18200. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise, extend, and improve the program established by title VI of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 18201. 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. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. ELENBORN, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. DAWSON, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. COWGER, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. GUDE, Mr. REUSS, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MONAGAN, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H.R. 18202. A bill to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office of the President and a Consumer Protection Agency in order to secure within the Federal Government effective protection and representation of the interests of consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. RANDELL, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. CULVER, and Mr. HICKS):

H.R. 18203. A bill to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office of

the President and a Consumer Protection Agency in order to secure within the Federal Government effective protection and representation of the interests of consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 18204. A bill to strengthen the internal security of the United States; to the Committee on Internal Security.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. BEALL of Maryland, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. MANN, Mr. COWGER, Mr. FISH, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. McCLOREY, and Mr. SNYDER):

H.R. 18205. A bill to make rules respecting military hostilities in the absence of a declaration of war; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 18206. A bill to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Pueblo of Santa Ana certain public domain lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NELSEN (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. McCLOREY, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LANGEN, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. STANTON, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. KING, Mr. QUIE, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BELCHER, and Mr. HOGAN):

H.R. 18207. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise, extend, and improve the program established by title VI of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H.R. 18208. A bill to protect consumers against unreasonable risk of injury from hazardous products and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 18209. A bill to protect consumers against unreasonable risk of injury from hazardous products and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHRIVER (for himself and Mr. SEEBELUS):

H.R. 18210. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide for the rail transportation of freight for the Department of Defense in general purpose boxcars owned by the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (for himself, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. BARING):

H.R. 18211. A bill to increase the availability of guaranteed home loan financing for veterans and to increase the income of the national service life insurance fund; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.J. Res. 1273. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.J. Res. 1274. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 1275. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating the 7-day period beginning August 16, 1970, as "All-American Family Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.J. Res. 1276. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate June 1, 1971, as "Medical Library Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.J. Res. 1277. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning September 20, 1970, and ending September 26, 1970, as "National Machine Tool Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H. Res. 1113. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to abolish the Committee on the District of Columbia and transfer the items of jurisdiction of that committee to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GUBSER (for himself, Mr. CONTE, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. SYMINGTON):

H. Res. 1114. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 1115. Resolution authorizing expenditures incurred by the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures to be paid from the contingent fund of the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 18212. A bill for the relief of Dr. Abraham Zigelboim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 18213. A bill for the relief of J. B. Riddle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

411. By Mr. LONG of Louisiana: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the Congress of the United States with respect to the calling of a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the power of Congress and the States to enact laws to prohibit sedition and criminal anarchy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

412. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Ohio, relative to the *Delta Queen*; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

521. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Ginowan City Assembly, Okinawa, Ryukyu Islands, relative to the removal of poison gas weapons from Okinawa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

522. Also, petition of the Koza City Assembly, Okinawa, Ryukyu Islands, relative to the removal of poison gas weapons from Okinawa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

523. Also, petition of the Urasoe Village Assembly, Okinawa, Ryukyu Islands, relative to the removal of poison gas weapons from Okinawa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

524. Petition of the Boston Society of Architects, Boston, Mass., relative to the war in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.