

(3) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law or executive agreement, if the President declares a commercial air traffic quarantine against any country (the "quarantined country") and any other country maintains commercial air traffic with that country, and unless the other country within thirty days after the declaration of quarantine shall effect a similar quarantine (by revoking the rights of its air carriers to land in the quarantined country and revoking the rights of air carriers of the quarantined country to land within its borders), then, following the expiration of such thirty-day period and with due notice to the air carriers affected:

(a) the President may revoke the rights of any air carrier of such other country to land in the United States; and

(b) the President may revoke the rights of any air carrier of the United States to land in such other country.

(4) A commercial air traffic quarantine declared pursuant to this section shall remain in effect until such time as:

(a) the President recommends to the Congress that the quarantine be terminated, and the Congress approves such recommendation by joint resolution; or

(b) the President gives notice to the Congress of his intention to terminate the quarantine in the absence of objection by either House of the Congress, and fifteen calendar days of continuous session of the Congress elapses during which there has not been passed in either the Senate or the House of Representatives a resolution stating in substance that it does not approve the proposed termination of the quarantine.

(5) A commercial aircraft quarantine declared pursuant to this section shall in no event preclude any emergency landing made in order to ensure the safety of an aircraft or any of its passengers or crew.

(6) The term "aircraft piracy" means any seizure, detention or exercise of control (or attempted seizure, detention or exercise of control), without lawful authority, or any commercial aircraft, its passengers or crew, regardless whether or not such action constitutes a criminal offense under the laws of the United States or any other country.

(7) For purposes of paragraph (b) of subsection (4) of this section, there shall be excluded, in the computation of such fifteen-day period, the days on which either the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of adjournment of more than three days to a day certain or an adjournment of the Congress sine die. The provisions of section 910-913 of title 5, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to the procedure to be followed in the Senate and House of Representatives in

the exercise of their respective responsibilities under such paragraph, except that references in such provisions to a "resolution with respect to a reorganization plan" shall be deemed for the purposes of this section to refer to a resolution of disapproval under such paragraph.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 10, 1970]

BOYCOTT NEEDED

The continuing ordeal of an augmented company of international air travelers held captive on the Jordanian desert by Palestinian desperadoes is the savage consequence of the failure of the community of nations to have acted decisively long ago on the crime of aerial hijacking.

This latest and most barbaric wave of hijackings should never have been possible if interested nations, airlines and crews had moved urgently and forcefully to strengthen security arrangements—which remain pathetically primitive—and to forge binding international agreements for dealing with hijackers and with those who abet air piracy.

We have long advocated action, now so tragically overdue, to impose boycotts on the air terminals of nations which in any way offer aid or encouragement to air piracy, and to deny landing privileges to planes of such countries. This should be done on an international basis for maximum effect and because all civilized countries have a stake in curbing this threat to their citizens' safety. Belated efforts to tighten security at airports and on planes must also be accelerated on a worldwide basis, regardless of any temporary inconvenience.

The United States should be prepared to take the lead and impose boycotts unilaterally, if necessary, as Senator Goodell and others have suggested. Failing such national or international action, the hesitant airline pilots have the right and duty to impose their own boycott in the interest of the passengers for whom they are responsible.

The immediate concern of everyone must be for the safety of the desert hostages. The appeal issued by the U.N. Security Council yesterday is a limited first step toward bringing the force of world opinion to bear against the pirates and anyone who might be tempted to condone their actions. The temptation to move at once to more forceful action is great, but where so many innocent lives are at stake diplomacy must be given every chance.

It must not be forgotten that the desperate aim of the Palestinian extremists is to wreck the revived Middle East peace talks which they have hysterically opposed. Unless this objective is frustrated, there will be diminishing security for everyone in the

Middle East, and for many outside the area, for years to come.

With this larger issue in mind, it is essential that the current situation be met with restraint and the closest cooperation of all parties, including the Arab states whose vital interests are as directly threatened by the guerrilla action as are those of Israel and the rest of the civilized world.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 11, 1970, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, September 10, 1970:

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

Robert H. Schnacke, of California, to be a U.S. district judge for the northern district of California vice George B. Harris, retired.

Donald W. VanArtsdalen, of Pennsylvania, to be a U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania vice a new position created under public law 91-272 approved June 2, 1970.

OFFICE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY

George Frank Mansur, Jr., of Texas, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Telecommunications Policy; new position.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, September 10, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

I therefore beg you to live a life worthy of the calling to which you have been called.—Ephesians 4: 1.

Eternal Father of our spirits, who in Thy word hast revealed to us the way, the truth, and the life, lead us, we pray Thee, to walk in Thy way, help us to believe Thy truth, and give us courage to live Thy life. Strengthen our hearts that in the midst of doubts within and disturbances without we may hold fast to those things we believe to be right and good for all.

Grant Thy blessing to all who work under the dome of this Capitol and to all who serve our Nation around the

world. May all of us be made strong to do what ought to be done and what must be done if law and order is to prevail, if justice is to be done, and if people are to live together in peace.

In the spirit of the Master Workman we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 18725. An act to establish a Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia and to provide for a Delegate to the House of Representatives from the District of Columbia.

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

H.R. 16968. An act to provide for the adjustment of the Government contribution with respect to the health benefits coverage of Federal employees and annuitants, and for other purposes.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
August 3, 1970.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: On July 29, 1970, I was served with a subpoena by the Assistant U.S. Attorney in Baltimore, Maryland, that was issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland. This subpoena is in connection with the case of the United States of America v. John Dowdy, et al.

This subpoena commands me to appear in said U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland on the 14th day of September 1970, and requested certain House records that are outlined in the subpoena itself.

The rules and practices of the House of Representatives dictate that no official of the House may, either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpoena duces tecum, produce such papers without the consent of the House being first obtained. It is further indicated that he may not supply copies of certain of the documents and papers requested without such consent.

The subpoena in question is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may wish to take.

Sincerely,
W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

[U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland, No. 70-0123]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. JOHN DOWDY,
ET AL.

To: Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

You are hereby commanded to appear in the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland at 421 Post Office Building, Calvert and Fayette Streets, in the city of Baltimore on the 14th day of September 1970 at 9:30 o'clock a.m. to testify in the case of *United States v. John Dowdy, et al.*, and bring with you all original roll call records of the U.S. House of Representatives for September 22, 1965.

This subpoena is issued upon application of the United States.

JULY 20, 1970.

BARNET D. SKOLNIK,
Assistant U.S. Attorney.
STEPHEN N. SACHS,
Special Assistant U.S. Attorney.
PAUL R. SCHLITZ,
Clerk.

The Speaker laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
August 11, 1970.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: On this date, the Sergeant at Arms and I were separately served with individual subpoenas by the Assistant U.S. Attorney in Baltimore, Maryland, that were issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland. These subpoenas are in connection with the case of the *United States of America v. John Dowdy, et al.*

These subpoenas command us to appear in said U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland on the 14th day of September 1970 and request certain House records that are outlined within the subpoenas, which are attached hereto.

The rules and practices of the House of Representatives indicate that no official of the House may, either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpoena duces tecum, produce such papers without the consent of the House being first obtained. It is further in-

dicated that such official may not supply copies of certain of the documents and papers requested without such consent.

The subpoenas in question are presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Sincerely,
W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

[U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland, No. 70-0123]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. JOHN DOWDY,
et al.

To Sergeant at Arms, U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the District of Maryland at 421 Post Office Building, Calvert and Fayette Streets, in the city of Baltimore on the 14th day of September 1970 at 9:30 o'clock a.m. to testify in the case of *United States v. John Dowdy, et al.* and bring with you copies of monthly bank statements and canceled checks pertaining to the checking account maintained by Representative John Dowdy (Sergeant at Arms checking account) during the period December 31, 1964, through August 30, 1965.

This subpoena is issued upon application of the United States.
August 6, 1970.

BARNET D. SKOLNIK,
Assistant U.S. Attorney.
STEPHEN N. SACHS,
Special Assistant U.S. Attorney.
PAUL R. SCHLITZ, Clerk.

[U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland, No. 70-0123]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. JOHN DOWDY,
et al.

To Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the District of Maryland at 421 Post Office Building, Calvert and Fayette Streets, in the city of Baltimore on the 14th day of September 1970 at 9:30 o'clock a.m. to testify in the case of *United States v. John Dowdy, et al.* and bring with you all campaign financial reports filed by or on behalf of John Dowdy for campaign years 1966 and 1968; and any reports, of any description whatsoever, filed by or on behalf of John Dowdy, at any time, pursuant to any resolution, rule, requirement, or practice of the House of Representatives, revealing items and sources of incomes and/or net worth.

This subpoena is issued upon application of the United States.
August 6, 1970.

BARNET D. SKOLNIK,
Assistant U.S. Attorney.
STEPHEN N. SACHS,
Special Assistant U.S. Attorney.
PAUL R. SCHLITZ, Clerk.

The Speaker laid before the House the following communication from the Sergeant at Arms:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
September 9, 1970.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Under a letter of August 11, 1970 the Clerk advised you of a subpoena that I received from the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland, No. 70-0123.

I have received another subpoena covering additional dates for records in this office that I am attaching hereto.

Since the change was made by the U.S. District Court, I am advising you in this matter. Respectfully,

ZEAKE W. JOHNSON, JR.,
Sergeant at Arms.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

[U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland, No. 70-0123]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v.
JOHN DOWDY, et al.

To Sergeant at Arms, U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the District of Maryland at Room 421, Post Office Building, Calvert and Fayette Streets, in the city of Baltimore on the 14th day of September 1970 at 9:30 o'clock a.m. to testify in the case of *United States v. John Dowdy, et al.* and bring with you copies of monthly bank statements, canceled checks, and deposit tickets pertaining to the checking account maintained by Representative John Dowdy (Sergeant at Arms checking account) during the period of December 31, 1964, through the present date.

This subpoena is issued upon application of the United States.
SEPTEMBER 4, 1970.

BARNET D. SKOLNIK,
Assistant U.S. Attorney.
STEPHEN N. SACHS,
Special Assistant U.S. Attorney.
PAUL R. SCHLITZ,
Clerk.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1204

Whereas in the case of the United States of America against John Dowdy, et al. (Criminal Action No. 70-0123), pending in the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, subpoenas duces tecum were issued by the said court and addressed to W. Pat Jennings, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court at 9:30 antemeridian on the 14th day of September 1970, and to bring with him certain documents in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives; Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such action thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That W. Pat Jennings, Clerk of the House, or any officer or employee in his office whom he may designate, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court in the subpoenas duces tecum before-mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in possession of the House of Representatives; be it further

Resolved, That when the said court determines upon the materiality and the rele-

vancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpoenas duces tecum, then the said court, through any of its officers or agents, be authorized to attend with all proper parties to the proceedings and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House, and take copies of those requested papers and documents which are in possession or control of the said Clerk; and the Clerk is authorized to supply certified copies of such documents or papers in his possession or control that the court has found to be material and relevant and which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said Clerk shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under the said Clerk; and be it further

Resolved, That as a respectful answer to the subpoenas duces tecum a copy of these resolutions be submitted to the said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1205

Whereas in the case of the United States of America against John Dowdy, et al (Criminal Action No. 70-0123), pending in the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, subpoenas duces tecum were issued by the said court and addressed to Zeake W. Johnson, Jr., Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court at 9:30 antemeridian on the 14th day of September, 1970, and to bring with him certain documents and papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such action thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That Zeake W. Johnson, Jr., Sergeant at Arms of the House, or any other officer or employee in his office whom he may designate, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court in the subpoenas duces tecum beforementioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in possession of the House of Representatives; be it further

Resolved, That when the said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpoenas duces tecum, then the said court, through any of its officers or agents, be authorized to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House, and take copies of said papers and documents; and the Sergeant at Arms is authorized to supply certified copies of such documents or papers in possession or control of said Sergeant at Arms that the court has found to be ma-

terial and relevant and which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said Sergeant at Arms shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under the said Sergeant at Arms; and be it further

Resolved, That as a respectful answer to the subpoenas duces tecum a copy of these resolutions be submitted to the said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARKUP SCHEDULED ON ORGANIZED CRIME AND EXPLOSIVES BILLS

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the continued wave of terrorist activities accentuated by recent malicious bombing in my congressional district makes it imperative that the House give antibombing legislation the highest possible priority for action.

I am delighted to advise the House that in response to my urging the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary during the recess informed me that markup sessions are already scheduled for next Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, September 14 through 17, on the Organized Crime Control Act—S. 30—and that he will propose to include in the markup the provisions of pending explosives control legislation—H.R. 16699, H.R. 17154, and H.R. 18573.

Hopefully, a meaningful and effective antiexplosives bill will be ready for a House vote before the end of the month.

A FIVE-POINT PROGRAM TO DETERMINATE INTERNATIONAL AIR PIRACY

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the circumstances surrounding the multiple hijackings by Arab terrorists makes it clear that once innocent air travelers become hostages it is most difficult to guarantee their safe return. Therefore, I believe the emphasis of our efforts must be on deterrent action to prevent hijackings.

In that connection I recommend:

First, creation of a special force of U.S. marshals who would travel as guards on all international flights of U.S. planes;

Second, installation of armor plates between cabin and cockpit of all U.S. aircraft; and the arming of all air crews on international flights;

Third, a thorough search of all passengers and baggage in international flights involving U.S. planes;

Fourth, a comprehensive inspection of all aircraft scheduled for international flights prior to the time any crew or passengers board the plane; and

Fifth, an embargo on air traffic to any country which refuses to free hijacking hostages and/or return the hijackers to the country of origin.

We must be wary of letting air piracy become a way of life and a regular tool in international relations. We must not be-

come blasé about something which so directly affects the very lives of so many people. A strong campaign of deterrence is essential and the five steps outlined above would make a major step in that direction.

PERMISSION FOR SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION TO SIT THIS AFTERNOON DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Subcommittee on Education be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL ACTION TO CURB SKYJACKING

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the fanatical and uncivilized acts of the Palestinian guerrillas has shocked the entire world and brought about a more universal understanding of the nature of the threat to Israel's existence as a free nation. The immediate concern is the safety of the passengers being held hostage and we must rely on behind the scene diplomatic efforts to secure their safe release.

The increasing number of skyjackings is another problem however and a long-range solution can only be found through bold and outspoken leadership at the international level. I had sponsored last year legislation, House Concurrent Resolution 340, expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should take all appropriate steps to reach an international agreement to assure extradition of any person accused of skyjacking without the safety of fleeing to a nation such as Syria which does not extradite skyjacks. There will be less temptation for those inclined to risk the lives of aircraft passengers and crew.

There has been little evidence of determined efforts by our Government in pressing for adoption of such an international agreement. For that reason I have renewed my request to the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to schedule public hearings on the legislation which I have cosponsored. I am taking this step in the hope that congressional action will induce the President to take a stronger position and exercise leadership in calling for international action to curb skyjacking.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. 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. 289]

Alexander	Edwards, Ala.	Morton
Anderson, Calif.	Edwards, La.	Murphy, N.Y.
Anderson, Ill.	Esch	Ottinger
Anderson, Tenn.	Fallon	Pelly
Ashley	Feighan	Pepper
Aspinall	Findley	Powell
Baring	Flynt	Price, Tex.
Beall, Md.	Fountain	Pryor, Ark.
Berry	Fraser	Purcell
Blackburn	Frey	Quile
Blatnik	Friedel	Rees
Brock	Fulton, Tenn.	Reld, N.Y.
Broomfield	Gallagher	Riegler
Buchanan	Gialmo	Rivers
Burke, Fla.	Gilbert	Rogers, Colo.
Burleson, Tex.	Goldwater	Roudebush
Burton, Utah	Gubser	Rousselot
Bush	Hagan	St Germain
Button	Hall	Scherle
Cabell	Hanna	Scheuer
Carey	Hansen, Wash.	Schneebell
Casey	Hays	Sebellus
Chappell	Hébert	Sisk
Chisholm	Hicks	Skubitz
Clancy	Hogan	Snyder
Clark	Jones, Ala.	Stephens
Clay	Jones, Tenn.	Stokes
Conyers	Keith	Stubblefield
Corman	Kuykendall	Stallcott
Coughlin	Landgrebe	Thompson, Ga.
Cowger	Landrum	Tunney
Cramer	Long, La.	Van Deerlin
Culver	Lowenstein	Watson
Daddario	Lujan	Weicker
Davis, Ga.	McCarthy	Whalen
Dawson	McCulloch	White
Delaney	Macdonald,	Wiggins
Dent	Mass.	Wilson, Bob
Diggs	Melcher	Wilson,
Dowdy	Meskill	Charles H.
Eckhardt	Miller, Calif.	Wold
	Minshall	Wyatt
	Monagan	Yatron

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 304 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

CONGRATULATIONS TO PRESIDENT NIXON

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been a long time since I have been able to stand here and congratulate President Nixon on any actions he may have taken concerning education.

But I stand here today to strongly congratulate him for finally releasing all of the funds which the Congress appropriated for loans to college students. This will allow thousands of additional students to attend college this fall and it will allow countless others to breathe easier in the knowledge that they will receive continued assistance. Here is a program that enables students to get aid that they must later repay so that future students may also benefit. It is not a giveaway or a handout. Rather, it is in the great American tradition. We are loaning money to students to allow them to help themselves.

While the President has taken an encouraging step, more must be done. It concerns me tremendously that we in the Congress are having to pull Mr. Nixon along when it comes to the field of education. Mr. Nixon vetoed this same

appropriation bill back on August 11, reasoning, I would imagine, that it is more important to build the SST than it is to educate our young people. The Congress wisely overrode this veto.

The President then stated that he would withhold \$66.1 million from the \$243 appropriation. Many of us here in the Congress pleaded with him to release these funds. Finally, yesterday he agreed to go along with our request.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the President to show the people of this country that he really does believe education is high on his list of priorities and to show that he does realize that we are trying to educate the leaders of tomorrow.

EMERGENCY COMMUNITY FACILITIES ACT OF 1970

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1178 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1178

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17795) to amend title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1178 provides for consideration of H.R. 17795, which, as reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, would increase and extend the authorization for grants to municipalities and other entities of local government throughout the Nation for the consideration of certain vital and urgently needed public facilities.

The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate. It also provides that after the Committee of the Whole has risen and reported the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted under the 5-minute rule, the previous question shall be considered as having been ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 17795 is designed to bring relief to many municipalities which today are unable to finance construction of urgently needed water and sewer facil-

ities due to the shortage of funds for long-term borrowing. The proposed legislation would help to meet the immediate needs for such facilities to provide the basic safeguards for the health and well-being of our citizens and to check widespread pollution of our irreplaceable water resources.

The critical nature of the existing situation is statistically shown by the reported number of grant applications for water and sewer facilities which have been rejected by the Department of Housing and Urban Development since 1966 due to the lack of funds. Every State of the Union has had some of its local government grant applications for water and sewer assistance go unfunded—from a modest three for the State of Idaho to a high of 426 for New York State. Even my own State of Hawaii has had a total of 19 rejected applications for water and sewer grants. These rejected applications from throughout the country amount to a total of \$2.5 billion.

H.R. 17795 would reenact the authorization for basic water and sewer facilities assistance provided for in title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, and would provide an additional \$1 billion authorization. The time within which a community may qualify for a grant would be extended for 1 year—to October 1, 1971—and a total authorization of \$1.35 billion would be available through fiscal year 1972, pending final congressional action on the fiscal year 1971 appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, an incidental but important benefit that would flow from the enactment of H.R. 17795 is the immediate boost it would give to the depressed construction industry. The essential facilities which would be provided under this legislation would lead to expanded housing construction and stem the Nation's rising rate of unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1178 in order that the bill may be considered.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Hawaii has explained House Resolution 1178 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of debate on H.R. 17795, the Community Facilities Act of 1970.

This piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, authorizes \$1 billion to be spent, as an amendment to the Housing Act, for sewer and water grants to communities throughout the United States.

Consideration of this legislation today is not realistic, Mr. Speaker. I want to call the attention of the Members to the fact that in the housing appropriation bill recently considered by the House an amendment was offered on the floor by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STEPHENS) to increase the appropriation in that bill from the budget figure of \$150 million to \$500 million. That amendment was carried on the floor of the House by a vote of 73 to 63 on a teller vote. Subsequently President Nixon vetoed the appropriation bill for housing, and one of the main reasons as given by the President was the fact that his budget figures had been exceeded, par-

ticularly in the area of grants to communities for sewer and water projects. The House sustained the President's veto.

The Committee on Appropriations is currently working on a new appropriation bill.

At the present time there are total authorizations of \$500 million for these programs. This piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, would add \$1 billion to the \$500 million that we already have authorized. The President vetoed the housing bill because it was over his budget, and this House sustained the President's veto. So here we have the Committee on Banking and Currency coming in with a piece of legislation that in my judgment has very, very little chance of ever seeing the light of day as far as appropriations of additional funds are concerned. This is fiscal irresponsibility to even be considering this \$1 billion authorization in view of the present circumstances.

We had a deficit this past fiscal year of \$2.9 billion, and a further deficit is anticipated at the present time for the current fiscal year.

It has been charged, and stated by the administration, that the Congress is the one that is going wild on the appropriation of funds and authorizing of funds over and above the President's budget. If the House considers this bill favorably today it adds credence to the arguments of the President, and of the administration, that the Congress is irresponsible in the matter of spending money. These funds have to come from the taxpayers. The taxpayers are mighty well fed up with the spending that is going on here in Washington, and in the Congress of the United States.

This debate this afternoon on this legislation, in view of what happened on the housing appropriation bill, is an idle gesture and an exercise in futility.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation is resoundingly rejected by the House this afternoon.

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

Mr. MARTIN. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would ask the gentleman if it is a fact that he is not opposed to the granting of the rule itself?

Mr. MARTIN. No; I do not oppose the granting of the rule. I am opposed to the legislation, and I expect to vote against it on final passage.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman I am sure is not against this bill that would provide good, clear water, and good environment, and that will prevent people from taking contaminated water out of wells.

What we have appropriated in the last bill will not do the job that lies before us. We have presently 4,300 applications waiting for consideration. We need \$4 billion, not \$1 billion.

I hope that the gentleman will give consideration to the health and welfare of these people in small towns and communities, which is where this money will go.

Mr. MARTIN. In answer to the gentleman's remarks, I would simply state that you have to spend money in accordance with your revenue. Sometimes you have to go without. You and I have to do it and every family in the United States sometimes has to go without things that we would like to have simply because we do not have enough money to purchase them. I think that is the case in this instance—we do not have the money to add \$1 billion to this program at the present time.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PATMAN. 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. 17795) to amend title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

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. 17795, with Mr. BROOKS 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. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN).

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, millions of words have been written and recited during this Congress about the Nation's critical housing shortage and the Nation's staggering problem of pollution control. Congress has unanimously agreed that these problems can and must be eliminated. But Congress and the Nation cannot begin to approach solutions to these crises without enactment of the legislation that is before your committee.

H.R. 17795, the Emergency Community Facilities Act of 1970, would authorize an additional appropriation of \$1 billion for water and sewer facility grants to communities under title VII of the Housing Act of 1965. Enactment of the bill and appropriation of funds already authorized, in addition to appropriation of the new authorization, would make a total of \$1.3 billion available in sewer and water facility grant money through fiscal year 1972.

The need for passage of the Emergency Community Facilities Act of 1970 was repeatedly exemplified by testimony from expert witnesses during hearings which disclosed that there are—

Hundreds of thousands of families living in communities across the Nation where water is obtained from wells which

are either in danger of being polluted or are actually being poisoned because there are no sewer facilities whatsoever;

Communities where some wells which have gone dry are now being used as septic tanks, with the result that sewage seeps into the area water table and pollutes the wells which remain in use;

Inadequate, antiquated sewer facilities in towns where sewage breaks out and runs into culverts carrying community water system pipes;

Cities where the streets are turned into rivers every time there is a heavy rain because storm sewer system facilities are completely inadequate. Resulting property losses have mounted into the hundreds of millions of dollars; and

Communities where disease has broken out because of such conditions and people have not only been made ill but, in some instances, have died.

Mr. Chairman, the local government officials who testified before the Banking and Currency Committee on this bill emphasized over and over that one of the most pressing problems facing the Nation's communities is the need for adequate water and sewer facilities. Moreover, in addition to the examples just given, they traced this unmet need to the civil unrest which has exploded in riots in some of our cities during the past 3 years. I will cite just one example:

The communities of Nellyville and Turpin Hill, which border the Augusta, Ga., city line, have no sewer facilities and water is supplied from contaminated wells. Both the city of Augusta and Richmond County have been endeavoring for some time to extend sewer and water service to these towns but could not justify the expense without Federal assistance of the kind that would be provided by this act.

After long delay, because such funds were not available, money was finally authorized to begin construction of facilities. Augusta's share of the authorization was not approved until last May and came at a time when disturbances there had reached a peak. Many of the people arrested during the riot in Augusta are residents of Nellyville and Turpin Hill who blamed the city for failing to provide the facilities they so desperately need.

That need was frequently expressed for more than a year and a half by groups of angry citizens meeting with Augusta's mayor and city council. The fact that the mayor had been trying to obtain necessary funding during much of this time and had made several trips to Washington to plead for money, held little meaning for these people. They were not concerned with the Federal Government. They held the city directly and solely responsible for intolerable living conditions.

In summing up the cause of the riot, Mayor Millard Beckum said:

This was no athletic contest. That riot was a damned expensive price to pay for the lack of service.

This is no isolated case. Its elements comprise appalling implications for our society. Delay in meeting such fundamental needs is interpreted as lack of concern by local government and the result is deep erosion of the faith and trust

which are essential to the existence of democracy. The failure of government to answer the needs of the people can be measured by the number and intensity of riots, burning, looting, of injury and loss of life.

Mr. Chairman, I have cited these examples in an effort to illustrate the great need to provide an additional \$1 billion for water and sewer facility grants which this bill would authorize through title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

A study conducted by the Joint Economic Committee in 1966, the year after title VII was enacted, concluded that expenditures by local government totaling \$3.5 billion a year would be required during the following 10 years to meet sewer and water facility needs throughout the Nation. This forecast turned out to be totally unrealistic in light of the national housing goals established 2 years later and because inflationary conditions since 1968 have raised construction costs at least 25 percent. New estimates place the annual investment required to meet water and sewer facility needs at \$5.2 billion.

A large part of that investment must come from the Federal Government through title VII. Local governments simply do not have the tax resources to shoulder the entire burden of this and many of the other services they must provide for their residents.

Insisting that our cities and towns can get along on their own or insisting that the trickle of Federal aid presently available to them for water and sewer facilities is adequate is to abandon our housing goals, make home ownership impossible for all but the wealthy and completely reject the idea of cleaning up our polluted streams, rivers, and lakes.

Lake Orion, a community in Michigan, is a good case in point. It has been ordered by the State health department to end pollution of a nearby stream. Compliance with the order means the construction of facilities that will, on the average, cost each household in the town \$5,250 in additional taxes over the life of the bonds that must be issued to raise the necessary capital. Local officials look on this demand as being virtually confiscatory but there is no other way to meet the State's order.

Multiply this situation by several hundred thousand and it is possible to begin to appreciate the overwhelming task that now confronts communities throughout the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, a moment ago I mentioned that a minimum \$5.2 billion a year is needed to finance needed water and sewage facilities throughout the country. Let me compare that with the amount of money that has been made available for sewer and water grants under title VII since the program went into operation in 1966.

Grants totaling \$514.6 million have been made for 1,151 projects. That is an average of \$128 million a year, or less than 3 percent of the total required annual expenditure. The comparison takes on pathetic irony when it is recognized that title VII is designed to provide

grants amounting to 50 percent and more of the total cost of the individual project. An authorization of \$1 billion for the program is a more realistic approach to the need, but it must be admitted that even this amount of aid will be inadequate.

Another indication of the absolute necessity to increase the number and dollar amount of water and sewer facility grants is the fact that since the program began the Department of Housing and Urban Development has rejected grant applications for a total of \$2.5 billion. As a result, urgently needed projects costing a total of at least \$5.5 billion were never undertaken.

The volume of applications has so outweighed the amount of available funds that HUD regional offices are even discouraging communities from making applications at all. In essence this amounts to telling the people of the Nation that Congress recognized the need for water and sewer facility grants and established a program to provide them but failed to make enough money available to lift the program above the level of tokenism.

Mr. Chairman, the crushing weight of inflation and the prevailing tight-money, high-interest-rate policy being applied to the Nation's economy add still more urgency to need for the Emergency Community Facilities Act of 1970. Water and sewer facility investments cannot be delayed until more favorable conditions exist in the bond market. These expenditures simply have to be made when they are needed regardless of whether interest rates are high or low. The fact that interest rates have been at historically high levels increases the need of local governments for the kind of financial help provided under title VII and multiplies the reasons for approval of this legislation.

While we are on the subject of the economy, it should be stressed that an appropriation of \$1 billion for sewer and water facility grants will have a substantial employment impact. We are all aware that unemployment is hovering around 5 percent, the highest level in 10 years, but what is not generally recognized is that unemployment in the construction industry has climbed to a depression era level of nearly 12 percent—more than twice the national average.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics has estimated that 100 jobs a year are created for each \$1 million invested in public facilities—40 onsite jobs and 60 jobs in industries providing materials and services. The \$1 billion authorized by H.R. 17795 translates into 100,000 onsite construction, manufacturing, and service jobs. But the entire impact of the legislation goes beyond this when the multiplier effect on the economy is considered. Studies conducted by the Joint Economic Committee and others have developed data showing that the impact of this kind of investment doubles its beneficial effect on the economy as the income it provides changes hands and is spent. As a result, the total employment impact of this authorization is not confined to construction, materials, and

required services. It is double that amount and will provide 200,000 new job opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like to quote from a statement made by Howard Atherton, president of the Georgia Municipal Association who represented the National League of Cities at the hearings held on the Emergency Community Facilities Act of 1970:

If the Government as a whole cannot provide for the people of this nation the most elementary service of proper waste disposal, then what claim can it make to the confidence of the citizenry? The effect is to cast serious doubt concerning the creditability of Government and its programs. It undoubtedly puzzles the citizens of Nellyville, Georgia how a nation that can land a man on the moon exposes its children to the hazards of standing sewage.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Am I correct in my understanding that practically all, if not all, the mayors and the Governors throughout the whole country are deeply interested in this legislation, and they are both Republican and Democratic mayors and Governors who have an intense interest in this legislation?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; the gentleman is certainly correct in his statement. In this country we have 81,299 mayors who are interested in the program, and I doubt that you would find even 1 percent of them against this bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. That was my understanding, and I wanted to have the gentleman's answer to my inquiry made a part of the record.

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is a very important bill.

Mr. PATMAN. It is a step in solving our pollution problem.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course it is.

Mr. PATMAN. It is an element in the fight against pollution and is for the health of the people.

Mr. McCORMACK. And those having direct responsibility politically on the State and the city level and on other local levels are overwhelmingly, without regard to political party, in favor of the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. And it is very necessary, I will say to the distinguished Speaker of the House, that we have a strong vote in favor of the bill. It would be wonderful if the vote for the bill were unanimous, because it would let the people know that we consider this high-priority legislation, and that we feel it is very necessary. It should be on the urgent list, the "must" list. We must do something about our water and sewer situation. It is too important for us to ignore it. I do not see how any Member could really vote against it.

In this bill we are fighting not only for the health of the people but also pollution and we are fighting for environmental quality.

We are fighting for environmental quality. How can we be for environmental quality and be against a bill of

this type, in which we are attempting to appropriate only about one-quarter or one-fifth of the amount of money actually needed to solve this problem?

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

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

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

Is it my understanding that Report No. 91-1263 is the report accompanying this bill?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. If so, where are the departmental reports?

Mr. PATMAN. I can assure the gentleman he would not find any departmental agency against it in the report.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to see it in print. Usually a report contains some evidence of what the Bureau of the Budget and other departments and agencies think of the proposal. This report is bereft of a single word.

Mr. PATMAN. That is often done but not required.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact, I ask the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the committee, that on page 25 of the hearings, which are in the possession of the Members today, is the statement made by the Honorable Samuel C. Jackson, Assistant Secretary for Metropolitan Planning and Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development? Is that not a fact?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, of course, hearings are not required either.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not think one could get a bill on the floor without hearings.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has a bill, accompanied by a report that is totally inadequate.

Mr. PATMAN. We think it is adequate for the bill, and certainly there is enough in here to indicate that the bill is in the public interest and should be adopted.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas consumed 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL).

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, this bill is on a subject that I think should have the No. 1 priority in this country. We have just marched up and down with respect to sewer and water funds when considering the Independent Offices bill. There were \$350 million in appropriations contained in the bill which the President vetoed and the veto was sustained in the House of Representatives. I opposed the action of the administration at the time when I voted to override the veto. I did so because basically I feel as I have stated this has the No. 1 priority of all of the programs we have in the United States.

We talk today, and day after day, and day after day, about pollution. We say

we are going to try to do all the things to cure air pollution, and water pollution, and all kinds of pollution in the United States, to assure the environmental health and the safety of our people. We cannot do anything anywhere in this country unless we have healthy American people. And they depend first and basically on water. They depend secondly on sanitary and adequate waste disposal. It is just foolish to talk about other programs as really having priority without this.

What has more priority than a drink of uncontaminated clean water? What good does it do to insure any retirement programs or to give more money for education or for cleaning up the ghettos, and so forth if we do not have clean water? What good does it do if we cannot provide the vital, necessary things that go with living?

I have differed for a number of years both with the Johnson administration and now with the Nixon administration as to the lack of priority afforded this program. I was a cosponsor of the original program. Further I have supported the enlargement and amplification of the program ever since it has been in being. To me it is of No. 1 importance, and it has been downgraded constantly in favor of other programs not immediately concerned with the health of the American people.

We have had no testimony from any community anywhere in the United States against this. It has wide acceptance. The communities of the United States want the program.

It is a program which requires participation of municipalities, because the funds are matching funds, 50 percent by the Federal Government and 50 percent by the local municipality.

I found, on investigation a couple of years ago, that there was a more than \$4 billion backlog of applications for funds under this program. Efforts were made at that time to overlook the need to discourage the applications, to send them to other departments and back and forth.

HUD has, through both administrations, the Johnson and Nixon administrations, discouraged further applications, saying there is no money for them. There was money at the time, however, for nonworking programs.

It was of extreme importance that the \$350 million in additional appropriations be enacted into law this year. But that is water over the dam. Why should we have another billion dollars of authorization, when we cannot get the \$350 million through the Appropriations Committee and the House to cover the existing authorizations?

I believe there is no real understanding of the problem, of the nature of the problem and the urgency of the problem. The fact is that one cannot overnight go in to clean up our water. But you can and should start the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, God bless them, and members of the committees, to go out and clean up a brook personally, and do other similar things. They can have all kinds of publicity. They can make us think we are making great progress on pollution while

we continue to actively pollute our water and to encourage active pollution by our failure to meet the growing needs and the urgent needs which presently exist.

I certainly believe we should pass this bill, and that we should support use of the unused authorization. We should give additional time for the appropriations committee to use up that authorization. Also, we should make available the additional billion dollars to cover applications that are there and can be substantiated as needed and which will really be approved.

To me this is a bill which is very valid, very critical, and should have the support of all Members of the House regardless of party.

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

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in enthusiastic support of H.R. 17795, the Emergency Community Facilities Act of 1970. This bill provides for an additional authorization of \$1 billion and re-enacts the balance of the authorization for basic water and sewer facilities provided for in title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. The bill would also extend for 1 year until October 1, 1971, the time within which a community may qualify for a basic water and sewer facilities grant, even though its program for an areawide system though under preparation has not been completed.

We all know that many of our communities are unable to finance the construction of urgently needed public facilities and that there is an immediate need for such facilities to provide the basic safeguards for the health and well-being of our citizens. I believe that this bill is another step toward making our environment more livable by checking the widespread water pollution problem and providing better means for waste disposal systems. The harmful inflation which this country is suffering from and the tight-money, high-interest-rate policy being applied to the economy by President Nixon add to the urgent need for the Emergency Community Facilities Act of 1970. Water and sewer facilities cannot be delayed by local communities until more favorable conditions exist in the bond market. These expenditures have to be made regardless of whether interest rates are high or low. Another important aspect that must be stressed regarding this bill is that an appropriation of the full \$1 billion being authorized for this program will have a substantial employment impact. The unemployment rate is presently at 5.1 percent and will probably go higher in the next few months. What is not generally known is that unemployment in the construction industry has climbed to nearly 12 percent, twice the national average. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has estimated that 100 jobs a year are created for each \$1 million invested in public facilities, 40 onsite jobs and 60 jobs in industries providing materials and services. The \$1 billion authorized in this bill translates into 100,000 onsite construction, manufactur-

ing, and service jobs. The impact of this kind of investment doubles its beneficial effect on the economy as the income it provides changes hands and is spent.

At the present time, there are on application with the Department of Housing and Urban Development 4,300 applications for water and sewer grants, representing \$2.5 billion in grant requests. Since grants under this program are 50 percent Federal grants and 50 percent local contribution, total project costs pending in applications add up to approximately \$5½ billion. This program has turned out to be probably the most popular program administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It is a program which essentially benefits our smaller communities.

I have enthusiastically endorsed the water and sewer grant program since it was enacted in 1965. Although the program does not directly benefit my city of Philadelphia, it does provide much needed Federal assistance to our medium-size and smaller cities. Local government officials have stated that one of their most pressing problems is the need for adequate water and sewer facilities. A number of witnesses before our committee stated that the unmet need for water and sewer facilities caused civil unrest in some cities during the past 3 years. How can we expect people to be satisfied with life when no sewer facilities or water is supplied to them or the water that is being supplied comes from contaminated wells. Recent estimates that were made regarding expenditures by local governments to meet sewer and water facility needs throughout the country for the next 10 years totaled almost \$5.2 billion. A large part of that figure must come from the Federal Government through title VII of the 1965 Housing Act.

We all know that local governments do not have tax resources to bear this entire burden. Up until now, Federal assistance for water and sewer facilities has only amounted to \$514.6 million for 1,151 projects through the country. These figures represent all the funds that have been made available over the past 5 years. This is an average of \$128 million a year or less than 3 percent of the total required annual expenditure. The authorization in this bill is a realistic approach to the need but it must be admitted that even this amount will be inadequate.

As I mentioned earlier regarding the figures of pending applications, the volume of these applications has so outweighed the amount of available funds that HUD regional offices are discouraging communities from making any applications at all. What this means to the people of our country is that Congress recognizes the need for water and sewer facilities grants, but has failed to make the money available.

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

Mr. WIDNALL. I thank the gentleman. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN).

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself also with the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL).

I think his statement is one of the most objective and articulate, on the question of water and sewage community facility requirements, presented during the course of this debate.

I have long supported this type of program that helps smaller communities, with a very limited financial capability, to develop badly needed water and sewage systems in order to avoid health problems to resolve pollution problems and to permit these areas to move toward enhancing their environment and their economic opportunities.

Further, it tends to tie in with the "reverse migration—rural revitalization and diversification" concept that I have been attempting to advance for a number of years.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE).

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

I would like to associate myself with and greatly commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL), the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, for his leadership in support of this bill and his very forthright statement. Even if we are unable to use all of the funds that would be authorized in this act, at the very least, we should give its passage strong support as a measure of the urgency to clean up the municipal waste problem of the Nation. We must press forward with all diligence with both research and implementation of the plans for the treatment plants needed to clean up the water of our Nation.

Mr. WIDNALL. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PATTEN).

Mr. PATTEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to compliment the gentleman on his remarks and be associated with him. Your county, Bergen, had one of the greatest growths in America after World War II. You saw a lot of building there, with the population doubling. My county has tripled in population since World War II. We will increase another 200,000 people in 10 years. We have raised the standards for sewer and water. Our people cannot build as they did in 1947 and 1948 with cesspools. We cannot build any more with wells in the backyard as half of the people did after World War II. We need this bill more than anything, just as you have stated. We cannot proceed with building homes any more until our municipalities provide the public water, sewers, and sewage disposal plants that are necessary. I hope that your words will be heard by the Members of this House and that this bill will pass by a large vote. This is what our section needs more than anything else in my judgment. Our greatest need is housing, and the builders cannot get approval because the water supply and sewers are not built.

Mr. WIDNALL. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENNIS. I am sure that the objectives of this bill are everything that the gentleman says. I just want to ask one question. In view of the veto which was sustained of the \$350 million appropriation, does the gentleman think there is really any realistic chance that an additional \$1 billion will actually be appropriated at this time?

Mr. WIDNALL. Very honestly I do not think that the extra \$1 billion will be appropriate at this time but I think it is very well to get it on the record as something available. It is also something that is urgent. We should have the additional authorization there so that we can bring the pressures necessary to get that appropriation. We all know that you cannot develop a program and get moneys allocated to it until we bring realistically into the hands of our Government and those administering the programs the urgent need. This bill is an expression of urgent need because of the fact that there are so many hundreds of millions of dollars in pending applications and applications that will be there almost overnight in order to take care of this situation.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, it would follow then that if there is no actual appropriation at this time then the construction, and so on, which the gentlemen have referred to here can hardly proceed without actual appropriation of money; is that not true?

Mr. WIDNALL. That is true. It is also true that while the \$350 million that was vetoed is necessary, I think this bill is needed in order to provide the further assurance of obtaining the funds to take care of the \$350 million in pending authorization. I do not think there is any question about the fact that Congress has to show what it actually feels about this. I am a little bit sick and tired of placing everything on a Bureau of the Budget basis. We have some very, very urgent requirements for our country. I know that inflation presses. I voted for some of the bills trying to cut the budget in order to restore more fiscal responsibility to the Congress and to the Government. I am willing to do it again, to increase my efforts in this area. However, I just fervently believe in this program, and have great faith in it. I think it can do more than any other program to attack at the grass roots the problem of the health of the people of America.

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

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

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

The gentleman is supporting a bill that would provide for an expenditure of \$1 billion. I do not know where it is proposed to get the money. Is the gentleman from New Jersey suggesting a tax increase?

Mr. WIDNALL. May I suggest this to the gentleman from Iowa: that we are going to be faced, I believe, with a tax

increase if we are going to do the things that are being called for now, and if we are to meet some of the problems caused by the big deficit in Government. It is an increasing deficit and needs to be eliminated.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think that a tax increase ought to come before the authorization of a billion dollars, for this or any other purpose, under the fiscal situation that exists? I am opposed to the bill and therefore I would not support a tax increase to provide the funds, but the spenders ought to provide the revenue.

Mr. WIDNALL. I think the recommendation for it should come from the administration.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I have one request for time.

I would like to know what the situation on the other side of the aisle is.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the gentleman from New Jersey use the time, because I do not know of but one other who seeks time.

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

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, Congress is back in session, and the stock market is down. This bill represents one of the reasons why, in my opinion. I think it is ludicrous; it makes a mockery of the whole budget authorization-appropriation process. I do not think Congress is getting the message.

The people in my district think that inflation is the No. 1 problem facing the Nation today, and I feel the same way.

It is my belief that the continuing erosion of the national economy because of inflation has become the most critical of our Nation's problems, and that in fact until the inflationary trend is halted the solution of other pressing problems could not adequately be solved.

There are many domestic problems that are demanding solution today, such as in the field of sewerage, in the fields of education, welfare, health, housing, transportation, manpower development and training, urban rehabilitation, and other matters in the transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

But the solution of these problems takes mountainous sums of money, even in an unheated economy, and, in times of inflation, these sums spiral upward to staggering levels. The factor of inflation causes the solution of these problems to cost more money and requires increases in the appropriations and increases inflation further, thus creating an unending vicious cycle.

I wrote some dissenting views in the report accompanying this bill which I call to your attention.

The House has already appropriated \$500 million for sewage treatment facilities under section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. This is \$350 million above the budget request. Now we are here today ready to authorize an additional \$1 billion on top of that.

We are told that the \$1 billion cannot be feasibly used. Of course, we should build additional sewers, and I am in favor of that. I suppose if we had \$5 billion or even \$10 billion, we could put it into sewer facilities. But I wonder whatever happened to the method of financing sewers by general obligation bonds at the local level. That is the way we finance sewer construction in the city of Columbus, Ohio.

Is the Federal Government to build all the sewers across the country? Is that what this is intended to say? It seems the Appropriations Committee has already said there is no additional \$1 billion.

So I think on the basis of these reasons that this bill should be defeated today as being inflationary and as not being realistic.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS).

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, failure to authorize this appropriation will be a clear demonstration to the entire country that this Congress is unwilling to meet an urgent, fundamental national need.

The money which this bill will provide is absolutely essential to safeguard the health of millions of people in thousands of communities across this Nation. Moreover, the national housing goals established 2 years ago by most of the people who are Members of this Congress cannot be met unless this measure is approved. Any concern that Congress may voice about pollution of our environment is nothing less than hollow statement without adoption of the Emergency Community Facilities Act of 1970.

Hearings held by the Banking and Currency Committee disclosed numerous instances where completely inadequate or nonexistent community sewer and water facilities pose an enormous threat to the health of residents. Representatives of the National Association of Counties presented the committee with the names and addresses of people who were made severely ill by disease contracted in locations where water systems had become polluted, where raw sewage was running on the ground where children walked and played, where water mains are located in ditches used to drain off sewage.

The examples cited by these officials did not begin to describe the completely inadequate conditions that prevail in community after community across the Nation.

As a matter of fact, we do not have to go far from this Chamber to find some first-hand examples. I am sure most of the Members present are familiar with news reports during recent months about delays in housing construction in the Washington area because of inadequate sewer facilities. Court and local government officials have had to tell homebuilders and homebuyers that houses cannot be constructed or, if constructed, cannot be occupied, because lack of sewer facilities creates a public menace. And this, I am afraid, is only the beginning of what is likely to become a problem of epidemic proportions.

How can the Nation possibly achieve a housing goal of 26 million new and rehabilitated dwelling units in 10 years when housing construction is held up before we even begin work to obtain a decent home and suitable living environment for all the people of the Nation?

These conditions are made even more appalling in a Nation which is unhesitatingly willing to spend billions for space explorations and millions to develop a supersonic transport plane for the benefit of the commercial airline industry. How can we possibly agree to do this when there are more than 30,000 communities without water systems and more than 40,000 without sewer systems in the country?

The failure to meet the essential need for adequate water and sewer facilities has been a national horror story for years. A 1966 joint economic committee study concluded that \$20 billion would be needed for community water facilities alone during the 10-year period ending in 1975 and an additional \$17.5 billion would be needed for sanitary sewer facilities during the same time. It should be noted that these projections, at the time they were made a few years ago, were described as conservative. They are even more so now.

To that projection should be added the fact that, since 1966, the Department of Housing and Urban Development has turned away applications for sewer and water facility grants totaling \$2.5 billion. During this period the Department has approved grants averaging \$150 million a year—a less than token effort to meet the problem.

There has been some criticism leveled at HUD in this regard. Questions have been raised about the Department's practice of actually discouraging communities from making application for grants and of holding up the release of funds for communities that have been approved. Be that as it may, the overriding problem centers on the fact that Congress and the administration have failed to provide anything approaching an adequate level of funds regardless of HUD's attitude and conduct. It is ironic to criticize HUD for failure to act when we have not provided it with the financial tools to begin doing the job. Moreover, the \$1 billion authorized by this measure is going to satisfy the need. Viewed realistically, it is a slow start, but a start nevertheless.

During recent months—primarily, I think, because this is an election year—many voices have been raised to call for a cutback in all Federal spending. I would ask these people to talk with the local officials of their constituencies and ask them whether these communities can provide themselves with critically needed public facilities solely out of their own tax resources. The answer in every case would be an unequivocal "No."

Representatives of the Nation's counties and cities appearing before the Banking and Currency Committee were quick to point out that the cost of financing new sewer and water system facilities in rapidly expanding urban areas is reaching the point of pricing people out of home ownership. Examples were given

to show that the additional burden imposed on local residents to pay for the bonds required to provide funds for such facilities adds up to thousands of dollars more in taxes for each household in these communities. The result is that existing facilities are inadequate and in a rapid state of decline, and that needed new facilities are not being provided.

It is true that the inability of communities to finance public facilities has stemmed in part during the last year from the high interest-tight money conditions which are strangling the Nation's economy. City after city found itself unable to market public facility bond issues because the maximum interest rate permitted for these obligations was not competitive with the yields of other types of securities. A return to rational monetary policies that provide the climate for reasonable interest rates will help to ease the problem for State and local governments. But it will by no means solve it. The tax resources of local communities are simply inadequate to meet all of the required public services that must be provided for our urban society. The funds must come from the Federal level, and to deny this is simply to ignore the need.

Let us take the opposite course. Let us recognize that the Emergency Community Facilities Act of 1970 represents an opportunity for this Congress to begin the work of establishing national priorities for the Nation's domestic needs. In this context nothing is more basic or urgently needed than adequate water and sewer facilities. We must not—we cannot—fall to make this admission and live up to our responsibility to the people of this Nation—to the people who have elected us as their representatives.

Mr. Chairman, let us, as we wind up, ask ourselves a few questions about the measure before us.

Is there a problem with our environment, with pollution, with water, and with sewers? Everybody knows the answer to that in this, the first year of the environmental decade. Pollution is a national disgrace.

What shall it profit a community to have the best waste water treatment plant in the world if it does not have the sewer system capable of transporting the waste down to that plant without spilling those wastes all over the landscape? That is what is happening now.

What good does it do for a community to attempt to build new homes for moderate income people, if it does not have the means of bringing them a pure and healthful water supply?

The next question is: Is this \$1 billion authorization needed?

Well, right on page 4 of the committee report is a statement furnished by the administration which shows that there are \$5.5 billion worth of current local applications pending. Here we are asking for only a \$1 billion authorization. More, that \$5.5 billion does not scratch the surface because so many communities have been discouraged by the fumbling of two administrations from even presenting their applications.

Then it is asked—where is the money to come from? I say that the money

must come from reordering our priorities.

If this administration thinks it is worth \$900 million to bail out the banks in the Penn Central Railroad fiasco; if this administration thinks it is worth \$1.3 billion of the taxpayers' money to build a supersonic transport plane; if this administration feels that we must spend \$70 billion plus on the military in this fiscal year; then, I say that surely we can find, by reordering priorities, the wherewithal to authorize \$1 billion for essential water and sewers.

It is said, finally, we are not assumed that there will be an appropriation.

Well, we heard that same sad story when we were about to appropriate an entirely inadequate \$214 million last year for sewage disposal plants, and now this year I am delighted that the appropriation is almost 5 times that—close to \$1 billion.

So I say that the stock market may have gone down today. I have not looked at the tape. But if this House will say this afternoon, in a resounding voice, that it wants to reorder priorities, that it wants to get away from the foolishness, and instead spend our money for the good of all the people, by authorizing \$1 billion for water and sewers, then I confidently expect the stock market to go up tomorrow.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PATTEN. I thank the gentleman. Our friend from Ohio seemed to think that it was novel for the Federal Government to help construct sewers. I became mayor of my municipality in 1934. The first contract I signed was a PWA grant of 45 percent for a million-dollar sewer facility in our community.

Ten years ago the Economic Council of the Federal Government recommended that we proceed in this way. We are telling the municipalities to stop building cesspools, stop using well water, for sanitary reasons. We cannot now proceed the way we did in the past, when men would go out and, with their own muscles, build their own homes. Today we have to have architects. Today we have to meet all kinds of regulations. We have higher standards.

In my district there are people who want to build homes but who are not allowed to do so under existing laws because the municipalities do not have sewers and public water connections. This is the number 1 problem.

Inflation was mentioned. In my district there are many young couples getting married who cannot find a place to live under \$190 a month, and there are old people who are having their houses sold out from them and they have no place to go. The greatest inflation is in the housing field, and the only way to cure it is to build another 2 or 3 million homes.

Mr. REUSS. I agree with the gentleman that it is essentially a question of homeownership, the homeowners of this country are going to demand clean water and a decent sanitary system. As it is now, if you have to pay for it out of

local real estate taxes on the homeowner in order to save your home you are going to ruin your home by endlessly extending the local property tax. There must be help from higher levels of government, and this bill will do it.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I find there is a Member on our side who would like an allocation of time. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I am one of the members of the Banking and Currency Committee who voted this bill out of committee. We voted this bill out of committee in June, and I can tell you that circumstances have certainly changed since then. When we voted this bill out of committee, we thought we had a balanced budget. We did not know what we know today, that our deficit for the fiscal year 1971 could easily run to \$15 billion.

In addition to that, we passed the Independent Offices and HUD bill at a figure of over a half billion over the budget. For this reason I voted against that appropriation bill and I voted to sustain the President's veto. That appropriation bill contained \$500 million to eliminate water pollution.

Today, we are considering adding another half billion dollars to the deficit which this Nation faces. I know from some of the comments that I have heard made here on the floor this afternoon that some people do not understand what it means to construct adequate sewage treatment plants or adequate water facilities.

I can tell you that over this country municipalities have banded together and have floated the general obligation bond issues that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLLIE) mentioned. They built the interceptor lines so the pollutants are not scattered all over the countryside. They have built adequate sanitary sewage treatment plants, and they are paying for them by user charges, not by increasing the real estate tax. The user charge is a sewer rent paid on a yearly basis by families, businesses, and other users. This sewer rent is not so high that it is difficult for anyone to pay.

In addition to that, municipalities all over this country have banded together and built water treatment plants, and they are supplying the people in their municipalities with clean water. They are doing this by charging a monthly charge or a yearly charge for water. This is the way this really should be handled.

The State and local and municipal governments have just as much responsibility in the field of pollution control as the Federal Government has. This year we have the highest budget in our history, \$200.8 billion, and we are facing a \$15 billion deficit by overspending. I believe we should leave this matter with the Appropriations Committee, which is right now rewriting the Independent Offices and HUD bill and see what they come back with. Then let us support the appropriation bill as long as it contains a reasonable sum of money to help municipalities accomplish the job of eliminating pollution as far as sanitary sewerage and water are concerned.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE).

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey said I implied the idea of financing sewers by Federal money was novel. I did not mean to imply that, and I know the Federal Government has financed many sewer projects. The novelty of it is that, by this bill, we are suggesting the Federal Government finance all sewer projects all over the country.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS) has touched on that. In connection with the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin, who suggests we should reorder priorities, I could not agree more with that and that we should build more sewer projects. Congress fixes priorities. However, I have decided from listening to witnesses before the Banking and Currency Committee that to reorder priorities means, "let us get more for our crowd." I say we should begin to live within our income.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the comments of the gentleman from Ohio. As far as the \$1.3 billion for the SST is concerned, as soon as these planes start to sell, the Federal Government will get their money back.

As far as reordering priorities, we can have the same argument every time anything comes up. As far as the gentleman from New Jersey, my esteemed colleague, (Mr. PATTEN), is concerned, I would like to say some of the municipalities in my district, which are above moderate income, have not faced up to this problem soon enough, but now they are facing up to it and they are facing up to this responsibility which is theirs.

Also, the Federal Government now owes so much money that the annual interest payment on the money we owe will reach \$30 billion by 1973. Think of the amount of good that could be accomplished by this \$30 billion that will be taken from our taxpayers to pay for the fiscal irresponsibility that is Federal deficit spending.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the gentleman from Pennsylvania his district and mine are contiguous, and Pennsylvania alone has 317 applications in for water and sewer grants, amounting to \$185 million. The gentleman certainly wants to help these people, I am sure. We have upstate many little towns where there is contaminated water, and it is coming down and children in Delaware and Philadelphia are poisoned.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman and I both know that Pennsylvania many years ago, in the 1940's, passed the Pennsylvania Clean Streams Act. The gentleman knows that the water quality in Pennsylvania, in general, has been improved tremendously since then. I say to the gentleman that many of these municipalities which have applications in for

Federal grants today should have moved much sooner, and they can perform and construct these projects if they get a 25-percent grant from the Federal Government instead of a 50-percent grant.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) such time as he may consume.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I have got to take this time to say that the popular thing to do here again this afternoon is talk about the need for spending another billion dollars to help clean up the environment. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT) a few moments ago made mention of the number of water and sewer grant applications that were submitted by the State of Pennsylvania and of course that could be said over and over again for every State in the Union.

If we at the Federal level hold out the prospect that the well will never run dry and that all one needs to do to fill a local need is file an application for Federal funding, you are going to get completely submerged with applications. This is nothing unique. We see it in every kind of federally funded program from A to Z.

It is difficult for one to take the floor of the House in opposition to a measure that has such a laudable purpose as cleaning up our rivers and streams, but someone has got to raise the question about the amount of tax dollars involved.

We have already tripled funds this year for water and sewer grants and now we are being asked to authorize another billion dollars even though it was obvious that when the House sustained the President's veto on the independent offices appropriation bill, one major concern was the \$350 million which was added to the \$150 million to help small towns and communities build water and sewer systems.

In reading the hearings on this measure, I find that one State alone, Georgia, is asking for \$147 million more than is now available to it for water and sewer construction. If we multiply this figure times the 50 States, we come up with something over \$7 billion, half of which would be expected to come from the Federal Government. These are astronomical figures we are talking about and the end is not in sight.

As members of the committee indicated in their dissenting views on this legislation, our Appropriations Committee is not about to come up with an additional \$1 billion this year. And I am personally getting a little sick and tired of our blindly going along in support of these authorizing pieces of legislation at exorbitantly high figures and then being pressured by the lobbying groups for full funding of those authorized levels.

I am going to vote against this piece of legislation not because I am opposed to Federal assistance to local communities for building sewers and waste treatment plants, but simply because we are talking about too much money at this time for this particular piece of legislation, and some of us have to be giving more than simple lipservice in support

of the President's all-out effort to stem the tide of inflation. This is another one of those occasions when we should say no to an additional \$1 billion of spending although I have no illusions that what I say here is going to be heeded by too many Members.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK).

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the Banking and Currency Committee for reporting out what I consider to be a major piece of legislation. The Emergency Community Facilities Act recognizes that there is an immediate need for public facilities in order to provide basic safeguards for the health and well-being of the residents of our smaller communities is a manifestation, Mr. Chairman, of the awareness of this Congress of the tremendous problems facing our rural areas.

I testified before both the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations and the Senate Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations about the terrible financial bind facing rural towns and areas. These local areas must have financing to assist them in their efforts to improve the environment.

This is not a specious argument. I want to call to your attention a survey made by the Farmers Home Administration in December 1969 to determine the need of the communities of 5,500 and less population for water and sewer systems in the rural areas. The survey reveals that a total of \$11 trillion will be required to improve and/or provide adequate water and sewer systems in our rural areas. These costs are estimated on the basis of the 1969 dollar, however, and experience has shown that costs for such construction rise at a rate of about 10 percent a year.

Now the bill before us today, H.R. 17795, brings to the forefront the need to check widespread water pollution as well as provide an effective and practical method of combating rising unemployment. It further provides an additional \$1 billion authorization for basic water and sewer facilities. And it extends for a year the time within which a community may qualify for a basic water and sewer facilities grant even though its program for an areawide system, though under preparation, has not been completed. This measure specifically deals with the title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 under which communities of more than 5,500 persons would be affected.

As an idea of the problem which exists in my State of Illinois, Clarence W. Klassen, chief sanitary engineer for the State of Illinois, has projected that for the next 10 years, Illinois will need \$1,241,782,000 to provide and adequate water supply to its population by 1980. The 10-year needs for waste treatment amount to \$2,300,000,000. And the 10-year needs for sewers is \$1,800,000,000. This is a total of \$5.3 billion over 10 years.

I insert data prepared from Mr. Klassen's figures, as follows:

STATE OF ILLINOIS

Total dollar projected needs for period
1970 to 1980

A. WATER SUPPLY

Source	\$186,301,000
Treatment	474,326,000
Distribution	355,007,000
Miscellaneous	226,148,000
Total	1,241,782,000

Notes: Miscellaneous included mechanical pumps and other equipment. Water supply needs projected are for public systems serving 10 or more housing or building units and are based upon a 10-percent per-year increase in construction costs (equipment, labor, et cetera).

B. WASTE TREATMENT

To enlarge and construct new treatment facilities to serve increased population and to serve property not now served or connected: Total, \$2,300,000,000.

C. SEWERS

Not including the proposed shore plan for the Chicago Sanitary District, needs for sewers to collect waste are: Total, \$1,800,000,000.

Total dollar projected needs to meet 1972 water quality standards

For 675 municipalities in Illinois: \$350,000,000 to upgrade plants.

Localities total dollar projected needs
1970 to 1980

Water supply needs for Rock Island County:	
Source	\$2,432,000
Treatment	6,188,000
Distribution	4,636,000
Miscellaneous	2,945,000
Total	16,201,000

Water supply needs for city of Peoria:	
Source	4,802,000
Treatment	12,153,000
Distribution	9,107,000
Miscellaneous	5,799,000
Total	31,861,000

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, this bill is truly an emergency bill. It is designed to provide funds for construction of urgently needed public facilities to safeguard the health and well-being of our citizens, to check widespread pollution, and to find an effective method to combat rising unemployment in the Nation which is increasing in many places at an alarming rate, and to provide more funds for urgently needed water and sewer facilities.

All these things are fine and in keeping with vital national goals and priorities.

But this bill is all too little to meet current needs of a most compelling nature. There are over \$5 billion worth of applications pending for these major, urgent needs. But this bill provides only for \$1 billion for these urgent purposes, or only about one-fifth of the number of pending applications, indeed even less, because there are other applications coming in every day.

While the bill will be helpful, it does not go nearly as far as required to meet a great many accumulated needs that must be met if we are to relieve intolerable conditions in our community life, and absorb some of the rapidly mounting unemployment that is ominously appearing in many places throughout the country.

While I commend the committee for bringing this bill to the floor, the need for a larger program is very great, and I urge that immediate consideration be given to increase the funds necessary to make an effective broadside attack upon a set of alarming national problems that must be tackled in a much broader and larger way, if we are to avoid many dangers and growing problems relating to the health, well-being and general welfare and safety of the American people.

We cannot, we must not stand by while unemployment gets higher and higher. We must act now before it is too late to bring timely relief in these crucial areas, whether they relate to urgent social problems, or the flood of cheap, foreign imports that are closing our factories.

It is the duty of this Congress to stay with these grave problems until they are solved. If we delay overall relief and action now, we will merely insure the certain development of much worse conditions and dangers than those which confront us today.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to voice my wholehearted support for H.R. 17795, the Emergency Community Facilities Act of 1970. The purpose of this vital legislation is to meet a pressing problem facing many of our communities, both urban and rural; namely, the inability to finance urgently needed water, and sewer facilities. Such facilities are needed to provide basic safeguards for the health of these communities. They are needed to purify water and to decontaminate sewage. They are needed to guarantee the public health standards which our citizens require and demand. These facilities are a major factor in the fight against pollution. Pollution has killed the fish in many of our lakes and streams and has made many unfit for swimming and other recreation. It is essential to clean up America's lakes and waterways. The sewage facilities which would be built under the Emergency Community Facilities Act of 1970 would be one step along the road to cleaner streams and lakes.

The basic water and sewer facilities provided under the Emergency Community Facilities Act of 1970 will not just fight pollution. They can also help in the current economic downturn by providing needed jobs in construction and the other skills necessary to build water and sewer facilities. The completed projects may help attract industry to those communities which presently lack the water and sewer facilities necessary for large scale manufacturing. Such facilities cannot guarantee that factories will be built, but their presence will enable these towns to vie in the keen competition for new industry.

The Emergency Community Facilities Act of 1970 would provide these additional sewer and water facilities by authorizing \$1 billion for grants under the public water and sewer facilities program operated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

This program is authorized under section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. Its purpose is to

help communities construct water and sewer facilities in order to promote orderly and efficient areawide community growth and development. The program provides grants of up to 50 percent for land and construction costs for new water and sewer facilities. In some cases, a grant may be up to 90 percent of land and construction costs if the community has less than 10,000 people.

Grants under the program can be made to any town, city, county, Indian tribe or public instrumentality. These broad eligibility standards make it possible for any community which needs to construct new sewer or water facilities to share in the \$1 billion authorization contained in H.R. 17795, the Emergency Community Facilities Act of 1970.

This proposed legislation is of vital importance, and I strongly urge that you support it. The effects of this legislation will be felt in many areas that are of vital importance to Americans. It will help provide pure drinking water. It will help to make our streams as pure and clean as they were when our forefathers first settled this country. The Emergency Community Facilities Act of 1970 will provide jobs for the unemployed. It will provide the facilities needed to attract industry to those rural small town communities which currently are losing population and vigor because they cannot provide the jobs necessary to retain their youth.

These are all vital needs. I urge your full support for H.R. 17795, the Emergency Community Facilities Act of 1970.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Emergency Community Facilities Act of 1970. This legislation authorizes an additional \$1 billion in fiscal 1971 for water and sewer facility grants to check widespread water pollution and to alleviate high unemployment.

The administration requested only \$150 million for this vital program. The Congress raised the amount to \$500 million in the HUD-Independent Offices appropriations bill. Even the latter sum, however, greatly understates the needs of local communities for funds to combat pollution. Since 1966, the Department of Housing and Urban Development has rejected approximately \$2.5 billion in applications for water and sewer facilities grants. In New Jersey alone, 163 applications for \$92.5 million have been returned to localities because of a lack of Federal funds.

This measure, if enacted, will have a substantial and beneficial impact on the Nation's deteriorating economy by providing needed employment opportunities in the depressed construction industry. During the past 8 months, the unemployed rate in the country has risen from 3.5 to 5.1 percent. Unemployment in the construction industry, however, has reached a level of approximately 12 percent, more than twice the national average.

Mr. Chairman, as an important step to help thousands of Americans without work and to halt water pollution, I strongly urge passage of H.R. 17795, the Community Facilities Act of 1970.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly urge and hope that this bill, H.R. 17795, the Emergency Community Facilities Act of 1970, will be promptly and overwhelmingly approved.

In my conviction, there are three very self-evident and imperative basic reasons that eminently justify the approval of this measure. First, there is an immediate and essential need of the water and sewer facilities that this bill would provide in order to safeguard the health and well-being of our citizens and contain the ever-spreading danger of water pollution; second, the evidence of record is strikingly clear that the already overburdened taxpayers in the great majority of our Nation's communities are totally unable to further finance the construction of these urgently required public facilities; and, third, the enactment of this bill, with the public facility construction projected, would provide an effective and practical method of combatting the alarming increase in unemployment.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress has, indeed, passed, over these last few years, a good many worthy measures designed to stop the present and prevent the future senseless pollution of our surroundings, including the Water Pollution Control Act of 1961, the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965, the Solid Waste Act of 1965, the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966, the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970, and several others. However, without sufficient money to implement the provisions of these and other measures, their well-meant designs and objectives cannot possibly be realized. That is why, Mr. Chairman, that throughout our legislative action on these measures, I have consistently appealed for reasonable increases in Federal appropriation assistance to carry out the purposes of the legislation, without which they are only empty and meaningless legislative gestures.

In my own State of Massachusetts, and I am sure in most every other State in the Union, local taxpayers are laboring under extreme financial hardships, especially in these inflationary times, and most municipal governments are sorely pressed to obtain adequate funds to even cover presently existing community programs and services.

Smaller communities throughout the country, like the towns bordering on the Blackstone River and other tributaries in my own congressional district, are in urgent and genuine need of greater Federal financial assistance if essential health and safety water and sewer lines are to be constructed.

Although many communities are making very strong efforts in trying to raise additional funds, their problems are compounded by the imposition of additional tax burdens which, of course, tend to discourage any new industry from moving into a particular area; at the same time, the striving communities cannot expect or hope to attract new industry without being able to furnish adequate water and sewer facilities. Let us clearly realize that the existing tight

money, high-interest rate policies make it practically impossible for most communities to obtain long-term financing for public facilities at reasonable interest rates and, with unemployment at 5 percent nationally and nearly 12 percent in the construction trades, local officials are understandably most hesitant and reluctant to place additional tax burdens upon their people.

Therefore, the only sensible and prudent answer to this financial frustration on the part of local communities throughout the Nation is the greater Federal assistance this bill would provide and, with rapidly increasing construction costs, it is obviously more economically feasible and protective of the taxpayers' money to initiate the building of these public facilities as quickly as possible.

Mr. Chairman, several months ago, the President of the United States made the central theme of his state of the Union message, and I am earnestly hopeful that he will exert his tremendous influence for the approval and use of these proposed increased appropriations to assist the harassed taxpayers in the towns and cities of Massachusetts and throughout the country to achieve and preserve a health and unpolluted environment.

As I have so often emphasized in the past, Mr. Chairman, the control and improvement of our environment has become as urgent as life itself and as non-partisan as eventual death, so I hope that my colleagues from both sides will overwhelmingly join together in the adoption of this legislation that is so clearly in the national interest.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I support the passage of the Emergency Community Facilities Act of 1970, as I have in the past supported other legislation to increase the Federal Government's assistance for the construction and expansion of sewage treatment facilities.

Nowhere will one find a better example of the need for this legislation than in my own district, the Fifth District of Maryland, which includes Charles County and Prince Georges County, one of the fastest growing counties in the Nation today. The tremendous growth Prince Georges County has experienced in recent years has naturally placed an exceptionally heavy burden on the Blue Plains sewage treatment facility which Prince Georges County has utilized in conjunction with the District of Columbia and Montgomery County.

This problem was brought to a head earlier this year when the Congress deleted funds from the District of Columbia appropriation bill for a \$40 million expansion of the Blue Plains facility and the Department of the Interior stated that Prince Georges and Montgomery Counties could no longer use that facility and must immediately seek other means to take care of their needs. Suburban and State officials, along with the Interior Department, has agreed that Maryland must provide additional plants to take care of new growth in the county and to cover present sewage treatment requirements.

Thereafter, in May, 1970, the Mary-

land Departments of Health, because of the serious deficiencies in the sewage treatment system, felt it necessary to order a moratorium on building construction in five areas in the Maryland suburbs including much of Prince Georges County. This moratorium will continue to be in effect until the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission can provide assurances that the present overload situation has been alleviated.

One particular area in my district known as the Westphalia Estates is facing a crisis due to the failure of septic tanks. In this area, the residents are literally living with sewage flowing in the streets, creating a serious hazard to their health which could have epidemic proportions. Their problem would have been resolved if the necessary sewage connections could have been made. Because of the existing problem, they can look forward to no relief unless some reversals are made.

In addition, there are numerous homeowners who have invested their savings in new homes but will not be able to move in because of the ban. The result will inevitably be not only hardships, but in increased cost to them.

This situation represents the type of "emergency" which can benefit most from the funds contained in this bill before us.

As I have said before, we can and must solve the water pollution problems of this country. It should be just as important to Members of Congress to desire to solve the pollution problems of the Nation's Capital and our national river, the Potomac. It is a question of whether we are willing to dedicate ourselves to committing the necessary resources and technology to solve these problems. The cost will be high today, but even higher tomorrow.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill we are considering today, H.R. 17795, is of vital concern to my State of West Virginia. At this time there are nearly 1,500 rural communities that either need new community water and waste disposal facilities or require substantial improvements in their present systems. To provide these improvements and new systems would cost approximately \$460 million and would effect close to a million West Virginians.

In my First Congressional District alone, there are 324 rural communities that need either a new system or improvements in their present systems. And at present construction costs it would require \$94 million to build these facilities.

Yet, at the present rate of funding, it would take 80 years to construct these systems for over the past 5 years, only \$6 million has been provided for financing water and waste disposal projects in the First Congressional District.

H.R. 17795 is particularly important to West Virginia Mr. Chairman, because it would allow sector 702 funds available to local public bodies without regard to the size of the community being served. Presently HUD policy is to refer applications of communities with less than 5,500 people to the Farmers Home Ad-

ministration, yet just this year 36 applications in West Virginia have been rejected because of the lack of funds under the FHA program.

The Emergency Community Facilities Act would allow funds to be channeled into smaller cities and rural communities by removing this roadblock.

Mr. Chairman, it is urgent that our rural communities be able to expand and build water and sewer facilities not only for the benefit of the citizens now living in these small communities, but so that they can accommodate expansion and have a chance to thrive. For too many years, we have seen our cities and metropolitan areas being choked with population vastly beyond their abilities to allow humane and livable conditions. And at the same time, we are letting our smaller rural communities fall into disrepair so that they are in a poor situation to compete for the location of industry.

It is time that we start planning for the revitalization of rural America so that millions of citizens will have a place to move for a saner way of life. And the key to this effort is the expansion of our investment in community water and sewage facilities.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, it is politically tempting to vote for this bill.

No one can oppose water and sewer projects and water treatment facilities for the cities and towns of America.

Certainly I do not oppose such worthwhile projects. But the truth is that this measure, purporting at this time to authorize the expenditure of \$1 billion for these purposes, is a delusion and a fraud.

The House recently passed the Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill, which was vetoed by the President in part because it appropriated \$500 million—\$350 million above the budget request—for these same purposes. This veto was sustained by the House—and I voted to sustain the veto, because the bill was \$500 million, overall, above the budget requests, and was clearly inflationary in the face of a probable deficit of \$10 to \$15 billion.

In the face of this recent record it would not only be obviously inconsistent for me to now vote to authorize the expenditure of \$1 billion for this same purpose, but it is also obviously completely unrealistic to expect the Committee on Appropriations to actually appropriate and provide such a sum of money. This committee is currently wrestling with the problem of bringing in a new HUD appropriation bill at a reduced figure, and this bill will of course contain moneys for water and sewer projects, but presumably in an amount less than the \$500 million previously appropriated, and almost certainly nowhere in the neighborhood of a billion dollars.

The billion dollars authorized by this bill will never be appropriated; and the billion dollars worth of sewers and water projects which gentlemen talk about so eloquently will never be built.

Every Member of the House knows this. We are simply going through a political exercise, for the sake of a political record. We are kidding no one—except the people who would like to have sewers, and the taxpayers who would

have to find the money if we were really going to appropriate it.

This is not building sewers; it is an election year gambit, in which I decline to participate.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 17795, the Emergency Community Facilities Act of 1970. This bill reflects the urgent need to construct water and sewer facilities and I strongly urge its approval.

The city of Fall River, Mass., in my congressional district, recently was forced to order its residents to boil their water before drinking it. Dangerous bacteria were found in the system and a very serious health hazard existed until the water mains could be flushed and the source of contamination discovered.

Many parts of the Fall River system are old and do not meet modern standards. The age of the system increases the chances of a breakdown with a consequent critical emergency such as that which just occurred. Fall River must move rapidly to modernize its system and will need assistance from State and Federal agencies in doing so.

Fall River is not alone in the situation which has arisen. The Emergency Community Facilities Act was developed by the House Banking and Currency Committee of which I am a member. Our committee is well aware of the national water and sewer needs we face. The overwhelming approval of the measure in committee reflects the great need.

In addition, this bill provides important fiscal flexibility to the water and sewer program by increasing the authorized limit on expenditures. Recent economic indicators point to an upswing in the economy and we must be prepared to take advantage of this improvement through Federal budgetary policies.

The development of adequate water and sewer facilities is basic to life and essential if improvements in our standard of living are to be achieved. Unless water and sewer installations are adequate to meet increasing demand, the health and well-being of our citizens will be seriously jeopardized.

In addition, these facilities are the most important factor in the fight against water pollution. The dumping of poorly treated wastes into our waterways creates a health hazard, is seriously harmful to fish and wildlife and is an esthetic blight.

Beyond the direct benefits which will accrue from the strengthening of our water and sewer programs are the indirect benefits we shall receive. Most important, the number of annual housing starts is now beginning to build from the slump it has been in and the facilities authorized by this bill will be needed for new housing construction.

And, it is clear that many of the Nation's communities are unable to finance completely the construction of urgently needed public facilities. This bill will assist them substantially.

I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that this body will recognize this need with a strong vote of approval for this legislation.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman,

the need for this authorization is, I think, immediately apparent. The most conservative of estimates from the Federal Water Quality Administration for sewage and water treatment facilities calls for \$10 billion over the 5 years from 1970-74. Other estimates, based on specific cost data gathered in a special survey by the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors, yield figures of \$25 billion over the 5 years from 1972-76 and \$33 to \$36 billion over the next 6 years. The \$1 billion we are asked to enact today, when added to the prior appropriation—also of about \$1 billion—will barely cover what is necessary for fiscal year 1971. These costs are substantial. However, I truly believe that they are also necessary.

Today, we hear a great deal about the need for a "reordering of our national priorities." Again and again we are admonished that the improvement of the quality of our environment, and hence of our life style, is the consummate challenge facing our wisdom and technical skill in the years to come. In H.R. 17795 we have a chance to take a step in the direction of both of these goals.

First of all, this bill provides basic safeguards for the health and well-being of the people of the United States. In so doing it allows us the opportunity to stress our commitment to human needs and priorities. Second, the facilities authorized by this bill will greatly help check widespread pollution of irreplaceable water sources. Thus, it will show that this body does believe in the imperative necessity of maintaining ecological balance and of improving environmental quality. This legislation seems, in fact, of a piece with that which we have already passed this session; for example, the Environmental Education Act and the act establishing the Council on Environmental Quality. Now we are called upon for deeds as well as words, or rather succinctly, to put our money where our mouth is.

Finally, it should provide an effective and practical method of combating rising unemployment. As the committee report indicates, while national unemployment is 5 percent, the level in the construction trades is a crushing 12 percent. This aspect again pertains to what we consider important. It is a chance to see if we can achieve a healthy, full employment economy without undue dependence on defense construction items.

We are faced with a need and a challenge. We are also faced with the opportunity to meet them both. Thus, I strongly urge the passage of H.R. 17795.

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that neither side desires to use further time, I ask that the bill be read.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 17795

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Emergency Community Facilities Act of 1970".

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that a large number of municipalities and other entities of local government throughout the Nation are unable to finance construction of vital and urgently needed public facilities because of the shortage of funds for long-term borrowing.

(b) The Congress further finds that there is an immediate need for such facilities in order to provide basic safeguards for the health and well-being of the people of the United States, to check widespread pollution of irreplaceable water sources, and to provide an effective and practical method of combating rising unemployment.

SEC. 3. (a) Section 708(a) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In addition, upon the enactment of the Emergency Community Facilities Act of 1970, there is authorized to be appropriated for grants under section 702 not to exceed \$1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1970."

(b) Section 708(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "1972".

(c) Section 702(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "1970" in clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "1971".

Mr. PATMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to be proposed? If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Brooks, 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. 17795) to amend title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, pursuant to House Resolution 1178, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. WYLIE

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WYLIE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WYLIE moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 17795, to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

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

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 281, nays 32, not voting 116, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

YEAS—281

Abbitt	Flowers	Mayne
Abernethy	Foley	Meeds
Adair	Ford, Gerald R.	Mikva
Adams	Ford,	Miller, Ohio
Addabbo	William D.	Mills
Albert	Frelinghuysen	Minish
Alexander	Fulton, Pa.	Mink
Andrews, Ala.	Fuqua	Minshall
Andrews,	Gallifanakis	Mizell
N. Dak.	Gallagher	Mollohan
Annunzio	Garmatz	Moorhead
Arends	Gaydos	Morgan
Ashley	Gettys	Morse
Ayres	Gilbert	Mosher
Baring	Gonzalez	Moss
Barrett	Gray	Murphy, Ill.
Belcher	Green, Oreg.	Myers
Bell, Calif.	Green, Pa.	Natcher
Bennett	Griffin	Nedzi
Bevill	Griffiths	Nelsen
Blaggi	Grover	Nichols
Blester	Gubser	Nix
Bingham	Gude	Obey
Blanton	Haley	O'Hara
Boggs	Hamilton	O'Konski
Boland	Hammer-	Olsen
Bolling	schmidt	O'Neal, Ga.
Bow	Hanley	O'Neill, Mass.
Brademas	Hansen, Idaho	Patman
Brasco	Harrington	Patten
Bray	Harsha	Perkins
Brinkley	Harvey	Pettis
Brooks	Hastings	Phillips
Broomfield	Hathaway	Pike
Brotzman	Hawkins	Pirnie
Brown, Calif.	Hechler, W. Va.	Poage
Brown, Mich.	Heckler, Mass.	Podell
Brown, Ohio	Helstoski	POff
Broyhill, N.C.	Henderson	Pollock
Broyhill, Va.	Hogan	Price, Ill.
Burke, Mass.	Holford	Pucinski
Burleson, Mo.	Horton	Quillen
Burton, Calif.	Hosmer	Railsback
Cayne, Pa.	Howard	Randall
Cafery	Hull	Reid, Ill.
Carter	Hungate	Reid, N.Y.
Cederberg	Hutchinson	Reifel
Celler	Ichord	Reuss
Chappell	Jacobs	Roberts
Clark	Jarman	Robison
Clausen,	Johnson, Calif.	Rodino
Don H.	Johnson, Pa.	Roe
Clay	Jonas	Rogers, Fla.
Cleveland	Jones, N.C.	Rooney, N.Y.
Cohelan	Karth	Rooney, Pa.
Collier	Kastenmeier	Rosenthal
Colmer	Kazen	Rostenkowski
Conte	Kee	Roth
Conyers	King	Roybal
Corbett	Kleppe	Ruppe
Coughlin	Kluczynski	Ruth
Culver	Koch	Ryan
Cunningham	Kyl	Satterfield
Daniels, N.J.	Kyros	Saylor
Dellenback	Langen	Schadeberg
Denny	Latta	Scheuer
Derwinski	Leggett	Schwengel
Dickinson	Lennon	Scott
Diggs	Lloyd	Shipley
Dingell	Long, Md.	Shriver
Donohue	Lukens	Slack
Dorn	McClory	Smith, Iowa
Downing	McCloskey	Smith, N.Y.
Dulski	McClure	Springer
Dwyer	McDade	Staford
Eckhardt	McDonald,	Staggers
Edmondson	Mich.	Stanton
Edwards, Calif.	McEwen	Steed
Elberg	McFall	Steiger, Ariz.
Eshleman	McKneally	Steiger, Wis.
Evans, Colo.	McMillan	Stratton
Evins, Tenn.	Mahon	Stuckey
Farbstein	Mailliard	Sullivan
Fascell	Mann	Symington
Fish	Mathias	Talcott
Fisher	Matsunaga	Taylor
Flood	May	Teague, Calif.

Teague, Tex.	Waggonner	Wyatt
Thompson, N.J.	Waldie	Wylder
Thomson, Wis.	Wampler	Wyman
Tiernan	Watts	Yates
Udall	Whitten	Zablocki
Ullman	Widnall	Zion
Vander Jagt	Wilson, Bob	Zwach
Vanik	Winn	
Vigorito	Wolff	

NAYS—32

Ashbrook	Devine	Montgomery
Betts	Duncan	Passman
Byrnes, Wis.	Erlenborn	Rarick
Camp	Foreman	Rhodes
Chamberlain	Goodling	Sandman
Clawson, Del	Gross	Schmitz
Collins	Hunt	Smith, Calif.
Conable	Marsh	Whalley
Crane	Martin	Williams
Davis, Wis.	Michel	Wylie
Dennis	Mize	

NOT VOTING—116

Anderson, Calif.	Fountain	Pickle
Anderson, Ill.	Fraser	Powell
Anderson,	Frey	Preyer, N.C.
Tenn.	Friedel	Price, Tex.
Aspinall	Fulton, Tenn.	Pryor, Ark.
Beall, Md.	Gialmo	Purcell
Berry	Gibbons	Quie
Blackburn	Goldwater	Rees
Blatnik	Hagan	Riegler
Brock	Hall	Rivers
Buchanan	Halpern	Rogers, Colo.
Burke, Fla.	Hanna	Roudebush
Burleson, Tex.	Hansen, Wash.	Rousselot
Burton, Utah	Hays	St Germain
Bush	Hébert	Scherle
Button	Hicks	Schneebell
Cabell	Jones, Ala.	Sebellus
Carey	Jones, Tenn.	Sikes
Casey	Keith	Sisk
Chisholm	Kuykendall	Skubitz
Clancy	Landgrebe	Snyder
Corman	Landrum	Stevens
Cowger	Long, La.	Stokes
Cramer	Lowenstein	Stubblefield
Daddario	Lujan	Taft
Daniel, Va.	McCarthy	Thompson, Ga.
Davis, Ga.	McCulloch	Tunney
Dawson	Macdonald,	Van Deerlin
de la Garza	Mass.	Watson
Delaney	MacGregor	Weicker
Dent	Madden	Whalen
Dowdy	Melcher	White
Edwards, Ala.	Meskill	Whitehurst
Edwards, La.	Miller, Calif.	Wiggins
Esch	Monagan	Wilson,
Fallon	Morton	Charles H.
Feighan	Murphy, N.Y.	Wold
Findley	Ottinger	Wright
Flynt	Pelly	Yatron
	Pepper	Young

So the bill was passed. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
 Mr. Hays with Mr. Morton.
 Mr. Burleson of Texas with Mr. Cramer.
 Mr. Daddario with Mr. Meskill.
 Mr. Cabell with Mr. Price of Texas.
 Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. Kuykendall.
 Mr. Dent with Mr. Beall of Maryland.
 Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Riegler.
 Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Roudebush.
 Mr. Friedel with Mr. Scherle.
 Mr. Fallon with Mr. Skubitz.
 Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Pelly.
 Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Wold.
 Mr. Rivers with Mr. Wiggins.
 Mr. Sisk with Mr. Goldwater.
 Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Brock.
 Mr. Monagan with Mr. Clancy.
 Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Cowger.
 Mr. Tunney with Mr. Powell.
 Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Taft.
 Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Bush.
 Mr. Corman with Mr. Halpern.
 Mr. Daniel of Virginia with Mr. Burton of Utah.
 Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Buchanan.
 Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Berry.
 Mr. Fountain with Mr. Burke of Florida.
 Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
 Mr. St Germain with Mr. Lujan.

Mr. Melcher with Mr. Esch.
 Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Rousset.
 Mr. White with Mr. McCulloch.
 Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Whalen.
 Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Findley.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Hall.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Blackman.
 Mr. Yatron with Mr. MacGregor.
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Button.
 Mr. Carey with Mr. Quie.
 Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Snyder.
 Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Frey.
 Mr. Hanna with Mr. Schneebell.
 Mr. Lowenstein with Mrs. Chisholm.
 Mr. Purcell with Mr. Sebellius.
 Mr. Stephens with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Watson of South Carolina.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Whitehurst.
 Mr. Madden with Mr. Landgrebe.
 Mr. Murphy with Mr. Casey.
 Mr. Pickle with Mr. Pepper.
 Mr. Feighan with Mr. Stokes.
 Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Fryor of North Carolina.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Jones of Alabama.
 Mr. Hicks with Mr. Fraser.
 Mr. Gibbons with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
 Mr. Young with Mr. Hagan.
 Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Rees.
 Mr. Kee with Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. NELSEN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

HEALTH INSURANCE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AND ANNUITANTS

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 16968) to provide for the adjustment of the Government contribution with respect to the health benefits coverage of Federal employees and annuitants, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and consider the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, except as provided by subsection (b) of section 8906 of title 5, United States Code, effective from the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after October 1, 1970, and continuing until the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1971, the biweekly Government contribution for health benefits for an employee or annuitant enrolled under a health benefits plan under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, shall be equal to 40 percent of the average of the subscription

charges in effect on the beginning date of the adjustment, with respect to self alone or self and family enrollments, as applicable, for the highest level of benefits offered by—

"(1) the service benefit plan;
 "(2) the indemnity benefit plan;
 "(3) the two employee organization plans with the largest number of enrollments, as determined by the Commission; and

"(4) the two comprehensive medical plans with the largest number of enrollments, as determined by the Commission."

"Sec. 2. Effective January 1, 1971, section 8906(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Government contribution for health benefits for employees or annuitants enrolled in health benefits plans under this chapter shall be adjusted on the first day of the first pay period of each year to an amount equal to 40 percent of the average of the subscription charges in effect on the beginning date of the adjustment, with respect to self alone or self and family enrollments, as applicable, for the highest level of benefits offered by—

"(1) the service benefit plan;
 "(2) the indemnity benefit plan;
 "(3) the two employee organization plans with the largest number of enrollments, as determined by the Commission; and

"(4) the two comprehensive medical plans with the largest number of enrollments, as determined by the Commission."

"Sec. 3. (a) Section 8901(3) (B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(B) a member of a family who receives an immediate annuity as the survivor of an employee or of a retired employee described by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph;"

"(b) Section 8901(3) (D) (i) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out ", having completed 5 or more years of service."

"Sec. 4. (a) Section 8907(a) (B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting 'and the Panama Canal Zone' immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof.

"(b) Section 8901(1) (ii) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting 'and the Panama Canal Zone' immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof.

"Sec. 5. (a) The Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (74 Stat. 849; Public Law 86-724) is amended as follows:

"(1) Section 2(4) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'and includes the Social Security Administration for purposes of supplementary medical insurance provided by part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act'; and

"(2) Sections 4(a) and 6(a) are each amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: 'The immediately preceding sentence shall not apply with respect to the plan for supplementary medical insurance provided by part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act.'; and

"(3) Section 9 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, there shall be no recovery of any payments of Government contributions under section 4 or 6 of this Act from any person when, in the judgment of the Commission, such person is without fault and recovery would be contrary to equity and good conscience."

"(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) of this section shall become effective on October 1, 1970."

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I have no intention of objecting, I merely reserve the

right to ask the gentleman to give us a brief explanation of what is in the amendment, and what action is proposed.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I will be happy to do so.

Mr. Speaker, on July 9 the House passed the bill, H.R. 16968, requiring the Government to increase its sharing ratio of premium charges under the Federal employees' health benefits program from an existing level of approximately 24 to 50 percent of the total charges, effective next January.

Yesterday, the Senate amended the House-passed measure to provide in lieu of that 50-percent figure, a Government contribution equal to 40 percent, effective October 1, 1970.

The cost of H.R. 16968 for calendar year 1971, as originally passed by the House, was estimated at \$314 million. In reducing the percentage of contemplated Government contribution from 50 to 40 percent, the Senate amendment reduces the estimated cost by \$89 million, to \$225 million for the calendar year 1971. This estimated cost is predicted upon an assumption that total premium rates will be further increased by approximately 12 percent in the next contract year beginning January 1971.

In addition to reducing the rate of Government contribution, the Senate also amended the effective date of the bill's provisions from January 1971 to October 1970. By so doing, the costs of the program for the remainder of the current contract or calendar year would be increased by \$35 million, and would present insurmountable administrative difficulties to the Civil Service Commission and all employing agencies in affecting the changes in employee-employer cost sharing within such a short time period.

A change in cost sharing, as proposed in the House version of the bill, was designed to take effect at the most practical and administratively workable date, the beginning of the new contract year, January 1971.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the amendment offered to the Senate amendment to H.R. 16968 will, in substance, agree to a 40-percent Government contribution, but effective in January 1971, and perfect the language of the Senate amendment. I am confident that the Senate will readily concur in the amendment offered, paving the way for the bill's early enactment into law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the unanimous adoption of the motion and the amendment offered.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman to state to the House what is proposed to be sent back to the other body.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. As I already indicated, the Senate adopted the House-passed version, but it added two amendments thereto, one reducing the Government's contribution from 50 to 40 percent, and the other making it effective as of October 1, this year. We would accept one of the amendments passed by the Senate, that is the one reducing the Government's contribution from 50 to 40

percent, but we would change the effective date to January 1, 1971, because the Civil Service Commission contracts with all of the insurance companies on a calendar year basis.

Mr. GROSS. That is the amendment the gentleman proposes to offer here?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. To change the effective date of the bill?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. GROSS. As the measure was messaged to the House?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. GROSS. And the gentleman states that the bill as it now stands, and if approved by the other body as to the effective date, will increase the Government expenditure for health benefits for Federal employees, including Members of Congress, by approximately \$225 million?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. That is correct. And that is based upon the assumption according to the testimony given by the Honorable Robert E. Hampton, Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, that there will be an increase in rates next year of approximately 12 percent.

Mr. GROSS. I see.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. And that is taken into consideration in the estimated cost.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, let the record show that I opposed the increase to 50 percent, and I oppose the increase to 40 percent. I have no desire to ask for a rollcall vote on this bill because I voted against it when it was originally before the House, but I do not want the record to show that I am opposed to the 40 percent, which is a 16-percent increase over the present 24-percent contribution by the taxpayers. Even a 16-percent increase is too rich for my blood.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Members that only yesterday the House passed a bill presumably to regulate the issuance of credit cards. I am sure, after noting the bill that was just approved by the House providing for an additional \$1 billion for the so-called environment and pollution, that what ought to have been done yesterday was to approve a measure regulating the issuance of gift certificates, drawn on the U.S. Treasury by the same Members of Congress.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the gentleman that the administration representatives who testified before the committee recommended in substance the bill that we are now considering.

The Civil Service Commission not only recommended the new formula by which these premiums would be determined in the future, as set forth in this bill, but also went as far as recommending an increase of Government contributions

from the present 24 percent to 38 percent.

The only difference is an additional 2 percent. I think the U.S. Government as an employer ought to be a model employer and set the highest standards and criteria for private industry to follow throughout the United States. This small gift of 2 percent should not destroy the United States standing as such a model employer.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the gentleman's views on this subject. But let me say again that so far as I am concerned personally, a 16-percent increase to 40 percent in the taxpayer's contribution to our health benefits, is too rich for my blood and, therefore, I oppose the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS)?

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DANIELS OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey moves to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That (a) section 8906(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as provided by subsection (b) of this section, the biweekly Government contribution for health benefits for employees or annuitants enrolled in health benefits plans under this chapter shall be adjusted, beginning on the first day of the first pay period of each year, to an amount equal to 40 percent of the average of the subscription charges in effect on the beginning date of the adjustment, with respect to self alone or self and family enrollments, as applicable, for the highest level of benefits offered by—

"(1) the service benefit plan;
 "(2) the indemnity benefit plan;
 "(3) the two employee organization plans with the largest number of enrollments, as determined by the Commission; and
 "(4) the two comprehensive medical plans with the largest number of enrollments, as determined by the Commission."

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall become effective at the beginning of the first applicable pay period which commences after December 31, 1970.

"Sec. 2. (a) Section 8901(3)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(B) a member of a family who receives an immediate annuity as the survivor of an employee or of a retired employee described by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph;"

"(b) Section 8901(3)(D)(i) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'having completed 5 or more years of service'.

"Sec. 3. (a) Section 8701(a)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting 'and the Panama Canal Zone' immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof.

"(b) Section 8901(1)(ii) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting 'and the Panama Canal Zone' immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof.

"Sec. 4. (a) The Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (74 Stat. 849; Public Law 86-724) is amended as follows:

"(1) Section 2(4) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end

thereof a comma and the following: 'and includes the Social Security Administration for purposes of supplementary medical insurance provided by part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act.';

"(2) Sections 4(a) and 6(a) are each amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: 'The immediately preceding sentence shall not apply with respect to the plan for supplementary medical insurance provided by part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act.'; and

"(3) Section 9 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, there shall be no recovery of any payments of Government contributions under section 4 or 6 of this Act from any person when, in the judgment of the Commission, such person is without fault and recovery would be contrary to equity and good conscience."

"(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) of this section shall become effective on January 1, 1971."

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

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I am very pleased to yield to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI).

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion by the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits.

The amendment proposed is identical, with a single change, to the health benefits bill passed by this House July 9, 1970, on a record vote of 284 to 57.

The change to which I refer is the adoption of the Senate provision fixing the Government's contribution to the health benefits premium cost at 40 percent, whereas the House-passed bill provided for a 50-percent Government contribution.

Presently, the Government's contribution is equal to approximately 24 percent of the total premium cost, leaving the employees to bear the excessive burden of paying the other 76 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe that the original House version is fully justified and that an equal sharing of premium costs between the Government and its employees would be both fair and consistent with what is being done in modern private enterprise.

However, from a practical standpoint, I feel that a Government contribution rate in excess of 40 percent cannot be finally approved and become law this year.

Accordingly, I strongly recommend adoption by the House of the motion by the gentleman from New Jersey.

Our health benefits bill, H.R. 16968, in this form represents a long step in the right direction—a step that is overdue and will at least partly correct an inequity under which our postal and other Federal employees and retirees have labored for the past decade.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS).

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report

the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to increase the contribution by the Federal Government to the cost of health benefits insurance, and for other purposes."

The amendment to the title was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL RAILROAD SAFETY AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS CONTROL

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1933) to provide for Federal railroad safety, hazardous materials control, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS)? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. STAGGERS, FRIEDEL, DINGELL, SPRINGER, and DEVINE.

SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11833) to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act in order to provide financial assistance for the construction of solid waste disposal facilities, to improve research programs pursuant to such act, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS)? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. STAGGERS, JARMAN, ROGERS of Florida, SPRINGER, and NELSEN.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 17982, CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1194 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1194

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17982) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for a one-year extension of financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to

the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 17982, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 3558, and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 17982 as passed by the House.

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

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no controversy on this bill. It is an open rule, providing for 1 hour of general debate. It is a bill that has been before the Congress before. I therefore reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1194 makes in order for consideration of H.R. 17982 under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of the bill is to extend for 1 year—through fiscal 1971—the financing provisions of current law with respect to the Corporation of Public Broadcasting.

A permanent system of financing was not proposed when the corporation was created in 1968. Since that time funds for the operations of the corporation have come from two sources: Appropriated funds and private gifts or grants.

The bill authorizes \$30 million for 1971 and also authorizes an additional appropriation of up to \$5 million which could only be used to match gifts, grants, and other private contributions. Thus the corporation's budget for the year could reach \$40 million.

The corporation is particularly active in two fields, program development and interconnection of the independent public television stations. The corporation has assisted in the funding for the development and production of "Sesame Street," the excellent children's program. It is now involved in negotiations with A.T. & T. on a rate structure with respect to use of the company's lines to interconnect participating public television stations into a nationwide hookup for programs of major interest. This network is expected to connect 166 public television stations.

The committee report makes clear that some permanent form of financing for the corporation must be developed soon.

There are no minority views.

I have no further request for time, but I reserve the balance of my time, and urge the adoption of the resolution.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 11913, COMMUNICABLE DISEASE CONTROL AMENDMENTS OF 1970

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1129 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1129

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11913) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide authorization for grants for communicable disease control. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. After the passage of H.R. 11913, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 2264, and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 11913 as passed by the House.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to this rule and reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Missouri, I know of no opposition to this rule, but I would just like to point out that this bill authorizes a 3-year program to continue the fight against communicable disease in the United States.

Authorizations contained in the bill are as follows:

Fiscal year:	Million
1970	\$20
1971	75
1972	90

Funds appropriated will be used by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to the States, and to local authorities with State approval, to assist in financing disease control pro-

grams. The diseases to be combated include TB, venereal disease, rubella, measles, polio, diphtheria, tetanus, whooping cough, and RH disease. These are capable of prevention by vaccination. Grant funds are generally used to purchase vaccines and pay personnel used to staff vaccination programs where they are needed.

The bill tends to reestablish to some degree the old category grants which, in the health field, were generally eliminated by the passage in 1966 of the Public Health Service Act which combined into one program a large number of category grant programs in the field. The theory was that the States themselves were the best judges of what areas needed first priority treatment. It is true that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in his budget presentation has earmarked specific amounts in a number of areas—but would Congress give him a blank check? Category grants, which can be used for no other purpose, are much more restrictive than an earmarking for budget presentation purposes.

The administration opposes the bill for this reason as evidenced by the letter from the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF FINANCING FOR CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 17982) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for a 1-year extension of financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 17982

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Public Broadcasting Financing Act of 1970".

SEC. 2. Subsection (k) of section 396 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 396 (k)) is amended to read as follows:

"(k) (1) There are authorized to be appropriated for expenses of the Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, the sum of \$9,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, the sum of \$20,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, the sum of \$30,000,000.

"(2) In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated by paragraph (1) of this subsection, there are authorized to be appropriated for payment to the Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, amounts equal to the amount of total grants, donations, bequests, or other contributions

(including money and the fair market value of any property) from non-Federal sources received by the Corporation under section 396(g)(2)(A) of this Act, during such fiscal year; except that the amount appropriated pursuant to this paragraph may not exceed \$5,000,000."

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 17982 would provide for a 1-year authorization of appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Under the bill, not more than \$30 million could be appropriated to the Corporation for fiscal year 1971. An additional amount of not more than \$5 million would be authorized to match gifts, grants, and other contributions to the Corporation.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting is a bipartisan, independent, nonprofit corporation which was established under the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. Its Board of Directors consists of 15 members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. No more than eight members of the Board may be members of the same political party. The President of the Corporation is John W. Macy, Jr., who many of the Members of the House know personally.

Under its charter, the Corporation has three principal functions—

First, to assist in the development of programs of high quality for presentation over public radio and television stations;

Second, to assist in the establishment and development of a system of interconnection for such stations, and

Third, to assist in the establishment and development of such stations.

To state its purpose in a slightly different way, Mr. Speaker, the Corporation must help in developing high quality program matter to be presented over the 190 or more public TV stations and over 400 public radio stations which cover most of the United States. In addition, the Corporation is charged with assisting in the promotion and development of public broadcasting stations.

Mr. Speaker, to clarify a matter that has been the source of some confusion, let me say that the term "public broadcasting station," refers to radio and television stations which many persons still refer to as educational broadcasting stations. The term "public" is considered to be much more descriptive of their operation than "educational" since almost all such stations present more than instructional programming. In fact, most such stations present a wide variety of high quality programming directed at all age groups.

The Corporation has been fully operational for about a year and a half now and in that time its accomplishments have, I think, been impressive.

It has been instrumental in beginning the development of national television production centers in Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, Pittsburgh, and San Francisco. Through grants and contracts it has assisted in the development and presentation of particular programs and series of programs. Perhaps the best example of these activities is "Sesame Street," a program developed and pro-

duced by the Children's Television Workshop. This series was designed for preschool children of low-income families. It consists of 142 programs which in many areas are shown several times a day. The series had its first run during the 1969-1970 school year and the results have been most encouraging. It is estimated that between six and seven million children saw the program each day over the 200-odd television stations showing it. Children who watched the program have been tested and have shown measurable educational advancement as a result of watching the "Sesame Street" series.

In carrying out its mandate to assist in developing a system of interconnection the CPB has established the Public Broadcasting Service, a nonprofit corporation, which will provide interconnection for public television stations. National Public Radio, another nonprofit corporation, has been established to provide for interconnection of public radio stations and to develop programs for presentation over those stations.

The Corporation has established a system of general support grants which are made directly to public broadcasting stations to assist them in better serving their public. These grants are expected to range between \$12,500 and \$32,500 for television stations, depending on such factors as the size of the station and the population served. In the case of public radio stations, these grants will amount to \$7,500. These funds can be used as the stations see fit for equipment, personnel, programming, or to meet other needs of the station.

The Corporation also has established a fellowship program under which promising individuals are given stipends to work and study in areas that will better prepare them to work in the field of public broadcasting.

Mr. Speaker, the committee feels that the results of the Corporation's activities are already living up to earlier promises, and that considerable progress lies ahead, subject only to the availability of sufficient financing to permit the Corporation to meet its potential for public benefit.

Already, because of the Corporation's action, local stations are stronger, and, more importantly, are now offering their viewers and listeners superior programs, able to compete in attractiveness with the offerings of commercial broadcasters. The key, of course, to successful programming that will attract audiences is money. Guided by a bipartisan Board of Directors, the Corporation is showing that more than full value is received for funds that have already been made available.

However, in the future the Corporation must have a workable permanent financing plan. We intend to see that it shall get one. I am told that efforts are now underway in the Corporation, at the Federal Communications Commission and in the administration to develop such a plan promptly. The bill submitted by the administration, which I and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER) introduced (H.R. 16338), would have provided an open end, 3-

year authorization for the Corporation. The committee has trimmed this back to 1 year in order to maintain more direct oversight with respect to the development of a permanent plan for financing the Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members of the House will give the legislation their consideration and support.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I do not quite understand why, on page 1 of the bill, there is authorized to be appropriated \$9 million for the year ending June 30, 1969, and \$20 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970. Why is this language contained in the bill since both fiscal years have expired?

Mr. STAGGERS. I will say to my colleague from Iowa (Mr. Gross) this is merely repeating the law as it is now. Perhaps my colleague from North Carolina (Mr. BROYHILL) can explain why it was kept in the bill in this form. The gentleman is the ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The only thing we did was to add the language: "and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, the sum of \$30,000,000."

That is all we added to the act, in effect, in that particular section. We did not strike any language in that section. All we did was add that language.

It could have been done differently, I agree, but this was the way it was done. The total effect is to add the authorization for 1 fiscal year for this program.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Speaker, do I correctly understand that this bill authorizes \$30 million, and that we may ignore the \$9 million and the \$20 million figures contained in the proposal?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. The date for the other has passed. We added the \$30 million in order to keep it in continuity.

It is \$30 million plus \$5 million, the gentleman should understand. The \$5 million is from matching grants which might come in from private sources.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. We can strike that language, but by leaving it in there it shows the history of what has been done in the past.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman tells me the bill authorizes \$30 million, plus the \$5 million in the next paragraph, for a total of \$35 million, I certainly accept his statement. I was nonplused by the additional language in the bill.

Let me ask a question of the gentleman of West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS). Is it proposed to go on in perpetuity appro-

riating to these so-called educational television projects? Is this television and radio, or just television?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. This is television and radio.

As I said, when the administration sent its bill up, which I introduced, it was for 3 years with an open end authorization. The committee in its wisdom thought the time had come for permanent financing. Public broadcasting has proposed a means of financing this program, but the administration has not yet OK'd it. We have to wait on the administration.

I am hopeful, and pretty certain, that by next year we will have a plan to finance public broadcasting. That is why the bill is for only 1 year.

Mr. GROSS. You will have a plan to finance it?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I was in hopes the gentleman would say we were going to get out of the business of subsidizing educational television. From what I have seen it is carrying advertising and propaganda, at least in this area. What happens to the revenue derived now from educational TV, or is there advertising on educational TV?

Mr. STAGGERS. There is no advertising whatsoever. It is prohibited.

Mr. GROSS. What am I looking at on Channel 20? Is WETA not an educational station?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Channel 20 is a commercial station. The educational channel in this area is Channel 26.

Mr. GROSS. And it carries no advertising at all?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. No.

Mr. GROSS. So we are going on indefinitely subsidizing educational TV and radio, is that correct?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I would say to the gentleman that, whether it be local, State or Federal, tax moneys have been going into educational television so long as I can remember.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman about this man—Woestendiek or something of that kind, who was fired from one of the educational TV stations in Washington, D.C. What was his salary?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, of course.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. The pronunciation of his name I believe is Woestendiek. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the hearings that we held in our subcommittee. In fact we held this bill up until we went into this gentleman's release from the local educational broadcasting station in great depth. I would like to call attention to that section of the hearings. The gentleman's salary as I recall it is listed in here. I do not recall the exact amount

but it is in the neighborhood of about \$35,000 to \$40,000.

Mr. GROSS. They do pay pretty good salaries in this educational television that is heavily subsidized by the Government, do they not?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I would say there is also a very excellent study in this hearing record concerning the overall contributions made to educational and instructional television by the Federal Government. You will find it is a very small percentage and that State and local governments contribute far more to educational and instructional television and public broadcasting than does the Federal Government.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I do not know whether that helps or hurts.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I am just saying that the Federal Government is a follower in contributions to this program nationwide over the years.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, it is something on the order of the bill that the House just approved, requiring the States to put up more and more matching funds. I can tell you that the requirement by the Federal Government for matching funds is killing the souls of the taxpayers all over this country. I am opposed to this bill.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from West Virginia stated this is a 1-year extension of the authorization of this program. The committee hoped that by the time we got through another year we could have some type of long-range financing program that we could present. We cannot promise that. I am sure the gentleman from West Virginia was not making an ironclad promise but certainly we on the committee are going to work toward that end and hopefully we can come up with a program.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting is a federally chartered, private, non-profit Corporation created to promote the growth and development of the Nation's noncommercial television and radio systems.

PURPOSES

First, to strengthen local public broadcasting stations so that they may better serve their community;

Second, to aid in the development of an effective national interconnection system for both public television and radio—the Public Broadcasting Service and National Public Radio;

Third, to augment the national inventory of programs by improving the production capacity of local stations; and

Fourth, to support the total public broadcasting system through activities such as talent development, audience research, and public information.

BASIC FACTS ABOUT PUBLIC BROADCASTING TELEVISION

Number of stations, 199.

Location: Every State in the Union except Alaska, Wyoming, and Montana.

Coverage: PTV signals reach 74 percent of the population.

Audience: Based on research October 1969, an estimated 24 million persons watch PTV each week.

Types of stations: 86 VHF; 112 UHF.

RADIO

Number of stations, 460. Number qualified for CPB grant assistance, 92.

Location: Every State except Mississippi, in which four stations are presently being constructed.

Coverage: Radio signals cover an estimated 75 percent of our population.

Audience: No accurate figure is available, but conservatively estimating, approximately 120 million people are reached by public radio.

Types of stations: 25 AM, 431 FM.

Station ownership: Public television and radio stations are owned and operated by nonprofit community organizations, universities, State authorities, local municipalities, and school systems.

Programming: Programming includes instructional courses, as well as programs that are educational in a broader sense. Public broadcasting schedules carry a mixture of public affairs, music, the arts, drama, and self-improvement programs for the community as well as instructional messages to classrooms. About 49 percent of the average broadcast day is devoted to instructional work.

FUNDING FOR THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

The Corporation is funded by the Federal Government and by private sources. In fiscal 1970, its total budget was \$17.4 million of which \$15 million came from the Government.

APPROXIMATE BUDGET BREAKDOWN

Local public radio and TV general support grants, \$3,500,000.

Local public radio and TV program production competitions, \$807,000.

Television programming, \$5,500,000.

Radio programming, \$441,000.

Interconnection charges, \$4,200,000.

Improving quality and training of local station personnel, \$600,000.

Administrative costs, \$1,600,000.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING MAJOR ACTIVITIES: 1970

Creation of the Public Broadcasting Service, the first nationwide regular interconnection facility for public television stations. PBS is an independent organization. The Corporation lead in its formation and is its chief source of financial support.

Creation of National Public Radio, which will serve as the primary national program service of public radio stations. NPR will produce, acquire, and distribute radio programs and related materials over a planned interconnected radio network. CPB also finances NPR.

With the aid of a 6-month planning grant from the U.S. Office of Education, created the Public Broadcasting Environmental crisis facing our Nation.

Provided general support for national program producers such as NET and the Children's Television Workshop—the producers of Sesame Street.

Establishment of TV production centers throughout the country for national programming.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING BOARD MEMBERS

Frank Pace, Jr., Chairman of the Board of CPB; president, International Executive Service Corps, New York, N.Y.

Joseph Beirne, president, Communication Workers of America, Washington, D.C.

Robert Benjamin, chairman, United Artists Corp., New York, N.Y.

Albert L. Cole, chairman, the Reader's Digest, Pleasantville, N.Y.

Michael Gammino, Jr., president, Columbus National Bank, Providence, R.I.

Saul Haas, chairman of the board, KIRO, Inc., Broadcast House, Seattle, Wash.

Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, editor and chairman of the board, the Houston Post, Houston, Tex.

Joseph Hughes, vice president, T. Mellon & Sons, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., chairman, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

Thomas Moore, chairman of the board, Ticketron, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Frank E. Schooley, director of broadcasting, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Jack Valenti, president, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., New York, N.Y.

John Hay Whitney, New York, N.Y.
Jack Wrather, Wrather Corp., Beverly Hills, Calif.

One vacancy.

DRUG EDUCATION PROJECT

Public TV station WQED in Pittsburgh, with CPB support, is undertaking a series of drug education programs. These programs will first be presented locally, tested as to effectiveness, revised, and then presented nationally over the Public Broadcasting Service beginning in early 1971. The project has three aspects. Programs will be prepared for:

First. General audiences. Parents and children, viewing at home, in prime time.

Second. Academic inservice training. Programs for teachers, school administrators, and school board members, to be presented in mid-afternoon time, or whenever these special but important audiences can see them most conveniently.

Third. Children in school. These programs, most difficult of all to do, will be geared for youngsters between 9 and about 13, for viewing in school. They will emphasize information and prevention, not rehabilitation.

The Corporation has budgeted \$500,000 for drug education.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING ENVIRONMENT CENTER

The Public Broadcasting Environment Center was established by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting in May 1970 with the aid of a \$600,000 planning grant from the U.S. Office of Education. The major purpose of the Center is to develop programming to foster a national understanding of the relationship of man to his environment as a means to keeping the balance between the two intact. To this end, the Center will:

First. Produce radio and television programs for target audiences in the general public;

Second. Produce material for classroom use and associated teacher training material; and

Third. Develop manpower training programs to provide labor for inspection, detection, and remedy of environmental problems.

The U.S. Office of Education grant has helped support an initial 6-month planning effort for the Center, which will develop a pilot for a radio and television series called "The Quality of Life." In this early stage, the Center has begun work on the tasks it has set for itself, which include setting up a reference library, identifying its target audiences, identifying possible production sources, and, most important, exploring avenues for the public's participation. The key to the Center's efforts is the quality of life—it is not as concerned with the environment per se as it is with living in that environment. The Center hopes to inform the public so that it will take action to improve its environment. The Corporation has budgeted \$1 million for the Public Broadcasting Environment Center in fiscal year 1972.

(Mr. SPRINGER (at the request of Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Public Broadcasting Corporation was created to encourage and assist in the creation of more and better programming for the growing number of television and radio stations owned by community organizations, universities, States, cities, and school systems. These stations, which are specially licensed by the FCC to provide educational and cultural material to the viewing and listening public, free of commercial connection, have come into existence in nearly every State. Most States have combined them into networks for the dissemination of this particular type of programming. At the present time there are 199 television stations in this category; 86 of them are VHF and 112 UHF. Radio stations number 460.

When the Corporation was authorized by Congress there were many of us who had some misgivings about the course it might take. Safeguards were built into the legislation to make certain that it would not get out of hand. No doubt these precautions were justified and may be partly responsible for the commendable record which is being made by the Corporation thus far. I think it is well to say that the people who have been selected to organize and run this Corporation have been dedicated and capable people. The results in the short time it has been in existence in the light of the inevitable problems of initial organization have been remarkable. Program production and origination has been encouraged in all parts of the country. Promising talent has been helped to improve and grow.

Funds to support the work of the Corporation have come from several sources. As might be expected at this stage of its development the bulk of the money has come from appropriated funds. In fiscal year 1970, \$15 million was appropriated and an additional \$2.4 million was supplied by public subscription and foundations. The amounts included here as public subscriptions does not take into account the many other millions contributed by the general public to build and sustain the stations themselves. As programming improves more of

this volunteer money will appear. It is for this reason that the bill which has been reported by our committee includes an authorization for \$5 million which is subject to matching. The Corporation can acquire as much of this money as it can obtain from outside sources. This is a great incentive for effort in this direction and great encouragement to those who are willing to lend financial support.

In addition to the seed money, the bill provides authorization for \$30 million for fiscal year 1971. Although the administration and the Corporation would have preferred a somewhat longer authorization, the committee felt obligated to restrict it in a continuing effort to work out a permanent financing plan for this whole operation. We have been telling the House each time the matter appears here that a permanent plan is being demanded. It has not yet appeared and we feel that the long-range good of the whole effort depends upon our continued insistence that this problem be solved. Although I would not try to claim that by doing what we recommend here today that beyond any doubt a satisfactory plan for permanent financing will be ready 1 year from today. I do claim that it will be done earlier because of our continuing pressure.

Purely educational programing is gaining rapidly because of the work of the Corporation. Most of the daytime hours on these stations is spent in direct classroom-type education or preliminary education efforts for preschoolers such as Sesame Street. Much more can be done in this area and much more can also be accomplished in the fields of art, drama, and self-improvement programs. The Corporation, I am glad to say, seems to be using the resources it has in sensible, progressive ways.

Another effort being carried forward by the Corporation is the creation of communication links between stations and the State networks of public broadcasting stations. Programs or events which have the greatest impact and value if shown simultaneously can be arranged if the means exist to bring the material to all stations interested in displaying it. Special arrangements with the Bell systems are almost complete to determine the cost of the system. Stations are under no obligation to accept any particular programs or to show them at any given time but some material will be useful if available while it is current. The Corporation is making this possible.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting has thus far been a sound investment and a modest one at that. I recommend that the bill be approved by the House.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1967, the Congress amended the Communications Act of 1934 by establishing a non-profit corporation to assist in establishing educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities. Thus, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting came into being.

The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 established the CPB because it was in the public interest to encourage the growth

and development of noncommercial educational radio and television, including the use of such media for instructional purposes. It is clear that the CPB has done its job well in these crucial formative years. There are 199 educational television stations and 460 educational radio stations. The TV stations are serving every State in the Union except Alaska, Wyoming, and Montana. The radio outlets are in every State except Mississippi.

The CPB has been able to do its job because Congress has seen fit to authorize the financing needed to date on a year-to-year basis. It is on that point that the problem arises. The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 sought to afford maximum protection to educational broadcasting from extraneous interference and control. It is clear from the hearings on the bill, that the best way to achieve this freedom from interference would be through a plan of long-term permanent financing for the CPB. This was the goal which the Congress was seeking when it first authorized the CPB to get underway. It is 1970, and such a plan has still not been enacted.

The bill before us today, H.R. 17982, merely authorizes a 1-year extension of the financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. The bill authorizes an appropriation of \$30 million, plus up to \$5 million for matching private contributions and grants for fiscal 1971. I am a cosponsor of this bill for two reasons: First, I support the efforts and commend the accomplishments of the CPB and thus believe we should continue to fund it. Second, I have cosponsored this bill because it is only a 1-year extension of the funding.

The original bill that was sent to the Communications Subcommittee in 1970—H.R. 16338—called for a 3-year extension of funding. I opposed this lengthy extension on the grounds that Congress initially set up CPB with the idea that long-term financing would be provided. But, a workable plan for such financing has not come forth. If we in Congress authorize a 3-year authorization, we will be guaranteeing that the necessity of a long-term, permanent finance plan will pass for 3 more years. This would be a travesty.

We in Congress should not let 3 more years pass without an adequate long-term financing plan which will permit the Corporation to be free of governmental procedure and administrative regulations that are incompatible with its purposes. We should avoid the overseeing of the CPB's day-to-day operations that would be a natural consequence of the annual budgeting and appropriations procedures.

The bill before us today was reported unanimously by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and I hope it will be passed by the House, not to show a lack of commitment to the corporation—but as an effective means of encouraging the administration to propose a plan of permanent financing. H.R. 17982 is an interim method of financing for the CPB.

I am today introducing a bill to provide permanent financing for the Cor-

poration for Public Broadcasting. The original draft of the bill is the result of a study which the CPB conducted, at my request, for the Subcommittee on Communications. It is my hope that our committee will hold hearings early in 1971 on this bill, so that 1 year from now Congress will have an opportunity to vote on a viable long-term financing plan. I regret that this report was not completed earlier, so as to allow the Subcommittee on Communications to hold hearings in 1970 on such a proposal. Similar requests for reports have been made by me to the Federal Communications Commission and to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I regret to say that neither group has offered any intensive or innovative study or plans to meet the need for permanent financing for the CPB.

This piece of legislation would amend the Communications Act of 1934 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for permanent financing for the CPB.

A public broadcasting fund would be established on the books of the Treasury.

The fund would be created and maintained on a continuing basis by deposits of: First, revenue from an excise tax on the value of radio and television receiving sets at the manufacturer or importer level, and

Second, funds in the general fund of the Treasury to match non-Federal contributions or payments to all elements—the Corporation, stations, and so forth—in the public broadcasting system, with the matching amount based on a formula calculated to stimulate and increase such non-Federal contributions or payments.

All moneys in the fund would be payable at the beginning of each fiscal year to the Corporation.

The Corporation believes—

This plan is best able to provide necessary financing under the particular conditions required for public broadcasting and most likely to be found acceptable by the Congress, the public, and the parties affected by it. However, each plan so far identified—including this one—has its shortcomings. Should new suggestions emerge, the Corporation would be glad to consider them in place of or as modifications to the plan outlined here.

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to register my strong opposition to this legislation.

Funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting should be abolished, not continued. Its stated purposes and activities read like a blueprint for a Government propaganda network. Coupled with the growing restrictions by the Federal Communications Commission on the program content of private broadcasters—of which the recent decision against Station WXUR in Media, Pa., is the latest and worst example—this brings us closer to outright control of the communications media by those able to influence the Federal Government in their favor.

Government broadcasting is fundamentally inimical to freedom. Every advanced totalitarian state provides for full government control of the communications media. As everyone should know by now, Federal funding means Federal

control. There should be no Federally funded broadcasting network.

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

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1194 the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 3558) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide continued financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STAGGERS moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 3558 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 17982, as passed.

The motion was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 17982) was laid on the table.

COMMUNICABLE DISEASE CONTROL AMENDMENTS OF 1970

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 11913) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide authorization for grants for communicable disease control, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11913

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Communicable Disease Control Amendments of 1969".

GRANTS FOR COMMUNICABLE DISEASE CONTROL

Sec. 2. Section 317 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 264) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) (1) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and \$90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, to enable the Secretary to make grants to States and, with the approval of the State health authority, to political subdivisions or instrumentalities of the States under this subsection. In the award of such grants the Secretary, in accordance with appropriate regulations, shall give consideration to the relative extent of the communicable disease problems and to the levels of performance in preventing and controlling such diseases. Such grants may be used to pay that portion of the cost of communicable disease control programs which is reasonably attributable to (A) purchase of

vaccines or other agents needed to protect those portions of the population determined to be epidemiologically important to the control or prevention of communicable diseases and (B) salaries and related expenses of additional State and local health personnel needed for planning, organizational, promotional, and other epidemiologic activities in connection with such programs, including studies to determine the communicable disease control needs of communities and the means of best meeting such needs and personnel and related expenses needed to maintain additional epidemiologic and laboratory surveillance occasioned by such programs.

"(2) for the purposes of this subsection—

"(A) a 'communicable disease control program' means a program which is designed and conducted so as to contribute to a nationwide effort against tuberculosis, venereal disease, rubella, measles, poliomyelitis, diphtheria, tetanus, whooping cough and other communicable diseases which are transmitted from State to State, are amenable to reduction, and which are determined by the Secretary on the recommendation of the National Advisory Health Council to be of national significance, and

"(B) the term 'State' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia.

"(3) Payments under this subsection may be made in advance on the basis of estimates or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of underpayments, or overpayments, in such installments and on such terms and conditions as the Secretary finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

"(4) The Secretary, at the request of a recipient of a grant under this subsection, may reduce the money grant to such recipient by the fair market value of any supplies (including vaccines and other preventive agents), or equipment furnished to such recipient and by the amount of the pay, allowances, traveling expenses, and any other costs in connection with the detail of an officer or employee to the recipient when the furnishing of such supplies or equipment, or of the detail of such officer or employee (as the case may be), is for the convenience of and at the request of such recipient and for the purpose of carrying out the program with respect to which the grant under this subsection is made. The amount by which any such grant is so reduced shall be available for payment by the Secretary of the costs incurred in furnishing the supplies, equipment, or personal services on which the reduction of such grant is based, but such amount shall be deemed a part of the grant to such recipient and shall, for the purposes of paragraph (3) of the subsection, be deemed to have been paid to such agency.

"(5) Nothing in this subsection shall limit or otherwise restrict the use of funds which are granted to a State or to a political subdivision of a State under other provisions of this Act or other Federal law and which are available for the conduct of communicable disease control programs from being used in connection with programs assisted through grants under this subsection.

"(6) Under this subsection, the Secretary shall be required to submit an annual report on performance in preventing and controlling communicable diseases."

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Communicable Disease Control Amendments of 1969".

GRANTS FOR COMMUNICABLE DISEASE CONTROL

Sec. 2. Section 317 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 264) is amended to read as follows:

"COMMUNICABLE DISEASE CONTROL AND VACCINATION ASSISTANCE

"Sec. 317. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and \$90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, to enable the Secretary to make grants to States and, with the approval of the State health authority, to political subdivisions or instrumentalities of the States under this subsection. In the award of such grants the Secretary shall give consideration to the relative extent of the problems relating to one or more of the diseases referred to in subsection (b) (1) and to the levels of performance in preventing and controlling such diseases. Such grants may be used for meeting the cost of communicable disease control programs, including the cost of studies to determine the communicable disease control needs of communities and the means of best meeting such needs.

"(b) For the purposes of this subsection—

"(1) a 'communicable disease control program' means a program which is designed and conducted so as to contribute to national protection against tuberculosis, venereal disease, rubella, measles, Rh disease, poliomyelitis, diphtheria, tetanus, whooping cough or other communicable diseases which are transmitted from State to State, are amenable to reduction, and which are determined by the Secretary on the recommendation of the National Advisory Health Council to be of national significance, and

"(2) the term 'State' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia.

"(c) Payments under this section may be made in advance on the basis of estimates or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of underpayments, or overpayments, in such installments and on such terms and conditions as the Secretary finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(d) The Secretary, at the request of a recipient of a grant under this section, may reduce such grant by the fair market value of any supplies (including vaccines and other preventive agents), or equipment furnished to such recipient and by the amount of the pay, allowances, traveling expenses, and any other costs in connection with the detail of an officer or employee to the recipient when the furnishing of such supplies or equipment, or of the detail of such officer or employee (as the case may be), is for the convenience of and at the request of such recipient and for the purpose of carrying out the program with respect to which the grant under this section is made. The amount by which any such grant is so reduced shall be available for payment by the Secretary of the costs incurred in furnishing the supplies, equipment, or personal services on which the reduction of such grant is based, but such amount shall be deemed a part of the grant to such recipient and shall, for the purposes of subsection (c), be deemed to have been paid to such agency.

"(e) Nothing in this section shall limit or otherwise restrict the use of funds which are granted to a State or to a political subdivision of a State under other provisions of this Act or other Federal law and which are available for the conduct of communicable disease control programs from being used in connection with programs assisted through grants under this section.

"(f) The Secretary shall submit an annual report to the President for submission to the Congress on the effectiveness of activities

assisted under this section in preventing and controlling communicable diseases.

"(g) Nothing in this section shall be construed to require any State or any political subdivision or instrumentality of a State to have a communicable disease control or vaccination program which would require any person who objects to such treatment to be treated, or to have any child or ward of his treated."

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer three amendments to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments to the committee amendment offered by Mr. STAGGERS: On page 4, line 25, strike out "1969" and insert in lieu thereof "1970".

On page 5, line 3, strike out "264" and insert in lieu thereof "247b".

On page 5, beginning in line 7, strike out "\$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and".

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendments to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS).

The amendments to the committee amendment were agreed to.

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

Mr. Speaker, the amendments just passed were technical amendments, and I would like to explain them just a little bit, because the first amendment just changed the title of the bill to read "Communicable Disease Control Amendments of 1970." The second was to correct an incorrect reference to the United States Code, and the third strikes out the authorization for the fiscal year 1970, since that fiscal year has already expired, and the bill carries authorizations for 2 years. It is a very important bill, in my opinion, to the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House today comes with the unanimous recommendation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would authorize a program of grants to the States for communicable disease control programs, with \$75 million authorized for that purpose for fiscal year 1971, and \$90 million for fiscal 1972.

This is not a new program. In 1955, Congress established the Poliomyelitis Vaccine Assistance Act, which was extended through 1962, at which time the program was expanded to provide funds to combat other diseases in addition to polio. The program was continued through June 30, 1968, but was permitted to expire at that time on the theory that the program of grants to the States under section 314 of the Public Health Service Act would suffice to meet the needs of the Nation in preventing and controlling communicable diseases.

Experience since 1968 has shown that

this hope was a false one, since our hearings demonstrated clearly that communicable disease programs have been funded at far less than adequate levels, and we face the possibility of epidemics in some of our cities today, particularly among the poor.

The program set out in this bill will supplement the programs provided for in section 314 of the Public Health Service Act, through providing specifically designated appropriations dealing with communicable disease prevention and control programs. The programs which can be funded under this bill include programs against tuberculosis, venereal disease, rubella, measles, poliomyelitis, diphtheria, tetanus, whooping cough or Rh disease, as well as any other disease that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare finds to be a major public health problem that is susceptible of practical elimination through vaccination or other preventive agents.

The cheapest possible form of medical care is prevention. Every dollar spent in prevention of disease provides multiple savings in the costs to our society of illness, not to mention permanent disability of the ill person and frequently unborn children as well.

Our committee was unanimous in reporting the bill to the House, and we urge its passage.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I am glad to yield to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

Mr. GROSS. By the time this bill is approved by both Houses of Congress it appears that the first quarter of the fiscal year 1971 will be gone. So why is the \$75 million not reduced to that extent?

Mr. STAGGERS. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that this has already passed the other body and we hope to get it passed and to conference next week and have it become law.

Of course, I am sure when it goes before the Committee on Appropriations they will take into consideration that part of the year has passed by.

Mr. GROSS. I notice the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations on the House floor I do not know whether I want to rely on the Committee on Appropriations for everything or not as much as I respect that committee. I think we ought to place some reliance and financial responsibility on the authorizing committees. I have no intention of voting for authorizing bills calling for \$75 million on the assumption that members of the Committee on Appropriations, out of the bigness and goodness of their hearts in behalf of the taxpayers of this country, will reduce that amount. They do not always do that.

I repeat—a quarter or nearly a quarter of this fiscal year is gone—and I do not know of any reason why we should authorize \$75 million for the full fiscal year 1971 which began on July 1, 1970.

Mr. STAGGERS. The bill was reported out of the committee in the month of May. It has taken all this time in trying to get it to the floor of the House, for many different reasons. But we have it here now.

The other body passed it a long time

ago. I am sure the authorization will not be used if it is not needed. It depends on the seriousness of what is involved here. This will be brought out before the Committee on Appropriations, because it is a serious problem and it affects your family and my family and all the women and children in America. It affects all individuals in this land—or it could affect them.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman another question.

This bill authorizes a total of \$165 million. Is this all the money that is being spent by the Federal Government on communicable diseases?

Mr. STAGGERS. No, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Could we get some kind of handle on how many more millions of dollars are being spent and by what agencies or departments of Government?

Mr. STAGGERS. The other programs are handled by the same department—HEW. There will have to be a correlation by the Department on this. They will spotlight these problems as they see them. There may be communicable disease problems right now that they have cleared up in different parts of the country, but in other sections they are expecting epidemics and some have already developed. That is the reason for this amount.

Mr. GROSS. They are expecting epidemics of venereal diseases?

Mr. STAGGERS. They already have them.

Mr. GROSS. Epidemics?

Mr. STAGGERS. Well almost and many of these diseases have certainly spread.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I think the gentleman will agree that in 1968 there were 431,000 new cases of gonorrhea already. For 1969, the figures are in, there were 494,000 cases. This is continuing with an increase at the rate of about 15 percent a year. From 1965 when there were about 300,000 cases, we are now at the 600,000 level.

Mr. GROSS. There is no question but that those figures portray a serious situation, but after all there are 200 million people in this country.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The gentleman, too, might be interested to know that the increase in measles this year over last year is 100 percent.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11913, the Communicable Disease Control Amendments of 1970, and this Nation's main program of preventive medicine.

Man has for centuries dreamed of eliminating killer diseases, and then, as our sciences developed, we put an end to such diseases as the plague. In just this

century we have developed cures for, or vaccines against, such one-time killers as polio, measles, smallpox, German measles, TB, and venereal diseases.

We look with great satisfaction and not too little smugness at what American medicine has brought us. But, I think, we are looking at our medical problems in the area of communicable diseases with a little too much apathy and smugness.

We know that we can prevent measles and polio. But both are on the rise because we have not carried out a proper vaccination program. In fact, we heard during hearings that some would have us eliminate funding for this program and just lump it in with the partnership for health program, thus allowing each State to take money from other ongoing programs for vaccines.

I wish I had the confidence to do this now, but I do not. I feel that partnership is not ready to absorb the Communicable Disease Act and that this attempt would be a disaster.

We see that States now do not require total immunization for preschoolers entering the first grade. In fact, 23 States have no requirements for immunization upon entering school. Thirty-four have no requirements for measles vaccination, 31 for polio, and 27 do not require smallpox.

Yet, there are more than 11 million children susceptible in the United States to common measles.

And common measles are not to be taken as lightly as many would have us believe. In the coming 12 months, there will be 700,000 cases of which 5,600 will need hospitalization, resulting in a loss of 1.1 million schooldays. More importantly, 250 will become permanently retarded and 75 will die. Seventy-five deaths from common measles.

Of those retarded, the families or agencies responsible will spend approximately \$25 million in the care of these children for the rest of their lives. With inflation being what it is, the cost per person may indeed double and we might actually see a figure between \$25 and \$50 million. And this, I would remind you, is just for 1 year.

In all, more than \$40 million will be spent by American citizens as a result of measles next year. And this does not include the more serious German measles, or rubella, as it is often called.

As you know, the German measles, if contracted by an expectant mother, can result in a birth defect. In fact, during the epidemic of 1964, 20,000 children were born with birth defects, many resulting in permanent mental retardation. The cost then to the American citizens and our Government was estimated at \$2 billion. The loss of life or a child's mind cannot really ever be estimated in dollars and cents.

According to our best medical forecast and with the help of history, we know that beginning next year, the rubella epidemic is again scheduled to hit the United States. And we know that there are about 36 million Americans susceptible. Men of medicine tell us that the dollars we are asking for still will not

solve the problem—but it is a real attempt to do something.

Yet, some want to pass the buck. Some here will say "Let the States do it through the block grant approach." Unfortunately, the problem is growing too rapidly and we need to zero in on communicable diseases. This is a national problem. This is an area where the magic of our medicine has given us a weapon to prevent disease. If we do not use that weapon, it will be an act of gross neglect on the part of the Congress. We have the power to prevent measles and Rubella. The legislation we are considering can do this.

There are, of course, other diseases which will be paid attention to under the provisions of this bill.

Diphtheria is a problem of the past, or so we would believe, because we have about eliminated it. Diphtheria had been cut way down until an epidemic in Texas put it back on the front page of every paper in Texas and in most papers throughout the Nation.

In Texas as of today, 135 cases have been recorded for 1970. The previous epidemic of diphtheria in Texas was 1945 when 82 cases were reported. In all, there have been 245 cases reported across the Nation as of today for 1970.

Diphtheria is up about 150 percent in this Nation.

Polio is up about 125 percent today.

Measles are up more than 100 percent today.

And each one of these diseases can and does kill.

We have, in addition to the humane responsibility, another angle to consider when discussing this legislation.

The cost of inflation is outrageous in this Nation today. Health has been given the short end of the budget stick and in fact the administration is lumping programs together in an attempt to save money at the expense of the American citizen.

As a result, it has become frighteningly evident over the past 2 years that health is being relegated to one of the lowest priorities in the budget.

This means Americans are not getting the health care that is needed and possible, and at the same time they are paying inflationary prices.

We are contributing to inflation when we have the power to keep people healthy through immunization and yet do not. It is inflation of the first magnitude if we can keep people out of the hospital and do not.

Unfortunately, there are many communicable diseases which are not preventable through immunization. Because of this and the fact that we have not solved the problem to really combat venereal diseases, we have seen epidemics in most of our major cities.

Gonorrhea has been increasing by about 15 percent a year for the past 5 years and in 1968, there were 431,000 new cases reported; 494,000 were reported in 1969. Needless to say, this represents only a part of the real problem.

Syphilis is also on the rise at alarming rates. If a person is infected with

syphilis and is not treated, one in 200 will go blind; one in 44 will become insane; one in 25 will be crippled or incapacitated; and one in 13 will develop heart disease.

We often think of tuberculosis as an extinct disease. But when two persons died of TB in the Nation's Capital, TB became a concern again—but, unfortunately, only for a couple of months.

Yet more than 6,000 people died of TB last year. And the city of New York alone spent more than \$40 million in 1968 to control TB.

Gentlemen, we have spent millions—even billions—of dollars seeking answers that would allow us to control and eliminate diseases as TB, measles, polio, and the like.

If we do not now vote to continue this program and to see to it that our young people are given protection from these diseases when we have preventative cures, then all the research which has preceded us will have been for nothing.

We have an opportunity to prevent sickness and death. I can hardly see any alternative to using this power for the betterment of our citizens.

Mr. MICHEL, Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a word of caution on H.R. 11913. I realize this legislation has strong support and that we should do everything in our power to control communicable disease.

However, there is a fear in some quarters that this bill calls for a duplication of the efforts of the partnership-for-health program of the Public Health Service Act.

The Bureau of the Budget states this position rather strongly. They said:

New legislative authority in this field is neither necessary nor desirable.

They added:

Formula grants under section 314(d) may be used for the whole range of public health services, including the prevention and control of communicable diseases. Similarly, project grants under section 314(e) are available and have been utilized for communicable disease control.

The members of the Labor-HEW Subcommittee on Appropriations were very concerned about the increase in communicable diseases when we funded nearly \$42 million this year, which was \$400,000 over the request and \$854,000 above the 1970 appropriation. Other funds, such as those for rubella vaccination, are also available.

The reestablishment of these categorical grant programs in the public health field may be unwarranted and possibly would complicate and confuse the grant authorizations we now have. In addition, the grant programs envisioned in H.R. 11913 run counter to the President's efforts to consolidate and simplify grant programs with the goal of achieving greater effectiveness and increased flexibility when distributing Federal funds.

Finally, even though the authorizations are high—\$20 million this year and increasing to \$90 million in 1972—I am not completely convinced that they offer a realistic prospect for fiscal security of the grant programs during periods of

budget belt tightening such as the one we are now experiencing.

I would prefer to go ahead with the clearly defined formula grant programs under section 314(d) of the Public Health Service Act which we now have. States are able to use their own judgment when allocating these funds for the control of communicable diseases. Under this concept, Federal aid in these areas tend to strengthen rather than inhibit the authority of State and local health agencies in the planning and control of their various health programs and activities.

Again, the prevention and control of communicable disease must receive our closest attention and concern, but let us make sure that when we fund these moneys we do under a grant consolidation program that will assure an effective Federal-State partnership in financing public health services.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11913, the Communicable Disease Control Amendments of 1970. This measure would assist the States to prevent or control the transmission or spread of diseases that can be controlled. Such diseases would include tuberculosis, venereal disease, rubella, measles, poliomyelitis, diphtheria, whooping cough, and Rh disease.

The elimination of the categorical grant approach to combat communicable disease has not worked out, and has resulted in the underfunding or non-existence of many programs. H.R. 11913 would restore some measure of control to the Congress to permit needed communicable disease authorizations.

One persuasive argument for the need for this legislation is the increase in communicable diseases which have vaccines or other preventive agents. Figures show a drastic increase in measles, although this is a disease which can be wiped out by use of a vaccine. Moreover, no Federal funds are going toward the purchase of measles vaccine, in spite of its increased incidence, although measles is a disease that sometimes bring serious complications such as encephalitis, otitis, and pneumonia.

German measles is another communicable disease that can be prevented with a vaccine. Although it brings only mild discomfort to children, if caught by a pregnant woman it can cause death, physical disability, and mental disorders to the unborn child. About 25 percent of women contracting German measles give birth to severely defective children. During the 1964 German measles epidemic, 20,000 children with congenital abnormalities were born. And it is predicted that there will be another Rubella outbreak shortly.

More than 24 million Americans are estimated to be infected with tuberculosis, yet only 1 million are receiving treatment in spite of therapy that has been proven highly effective for more than 95 percent of newly diagnosed cases. Newark has the highest active tuberculosis rate of any city with more than 250,000 population, although the disease can be controlled through adequate treatment for those infected and preventive treatment for those exposed.

Venereal disease is another communicable disease problem. It is on the incline, and accounts for some 2,400 deaths each year, not to mention those who are maimed or disabled. New Jersey had the highest percentage increase in infectious syphilis in the last fiscal year.

Although there is a poliomyelitis vaccine, many youngsters are not receiving it. Census estimates show that in 1969, over 5 million persons under the age of 20 had not received polio immunization.

Rh disease, another preventable disease, can lead to death, severe anemia, and jaundice of infants. The March of Dimes estimated that one out of every four women who need the vaccine are not receiving it.

The foregoing statistics provide reason enough for the continuation of Federal communicable disease assistance. Unfortunately, we have not yet eradicated many diseases even though we have had the tools to do so. H.R. 11913 provides one means of attaining the eradication of diseases that can be wiped out, and I heartily support it.

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

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

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

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 313, nays 1, not voting 115, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]
YEAS—313

Abbutt	Brown, Mich.	Dennis
Abernethy	Brown, Ohio	Derwinski
Adair	Broyhill, N.C.	Devine
Adams	Broyhill, Va.	Dickinson
Addabbo	Burke, Mass.	Diggs
Albert	Burlison, Mo.	Dingell
Alexander	Burton, Calif.	Donohue
Andrews, Ala.	Byrne, Pa.	Dorn
Andrews,	Caffery	Downing
N. Dak.	Camp	Dulski
Annunzio	Carter	Duncan
Arends	Cederberg	Dwyer
Ashbrook	Chamberlain	Eckhardt
Ashley	Chappell	Edmondson
Baring	Clark	Edwards, Calif.
Aspinall	Clarus	Ellberg
Barrett	Don H.	Erlenborn
Beall, Md.	Clawson, Del.	Eshleman
Belcher	Clay	Evans, Colo.
Bell, Calif.	Cleveland	Evins, Tenn.
Bennett	Cohelan	Farbstein
Betts	Collier	Fascell
Bevill	Collins	Fish
Biaggi	Colmer	Fisher
Blester	Conable	Flood
Bingham	Conte	Flowers
Blanton	Conyers	Foley
Boggs	Corbett	Ford, Gerald R.
Boland	Coughlin	Ford,
Bolling	Crane	William D.
Bow	Culver	Foreman
Brademas	Cunningham	Frelinghuysen
Brasco	Daniel, Va.	Fulton, Pa.
Bray	Daniels, N.J.	Fuqua
Brinkley	Davis, Wis.	Galifianakis
Brooks	Dellenback	Gallagher
Brotzman	Denney	Garmatz
Brown, Calif.		Gaydos

Gettys	McFall	Rodino
Gilbert	McKeally	Roe
Gonzalez	McMillan	Rogers, Fla.
Goodling	Madden	Rooney, N.Y.
Gray	Mahon	Rooney, Pa.
Green, Oreg.	Maillard	Rosenthal
Green, Pa.	Mann	Rostenkowski
Griffin	Marsh	Roth
Griffiths	Martin	Roybal
Gross	Mathias	Ruppe
Grover	Matsunaga	Ruth
Gubser	May	Ryan
Gude	Mayne	Sandman
Haley	Meeds	Satterfield
Halpern	Michel	Saylor
Hamilton	Mikva	Schadeberg
Hammer-	Miller, Ohio	Scheuer
schmidt	Mills	Schmitz
Hanley	Minish	Scott
Hansen, Idaho	Mink	Scott
Harrington	Minshall	Shibley
Harsha	Mize	Shriver
Harvey	Mizell	Sikes
Hastings	Mollohan	Slack
Hathaway	Montgomery	Smith, Calif.
Hawkins	Moorhead	Smith, Iowa
Hechler, W. Va.	Morgan	Smith, N.Y.
Heckler, Mass.	Morse	Springer
Helstoski	Mosher	Stafford
Henderson	Moss	Staggers
Hogan	Murphy, Ill.	Stanton
Hollifield	Myers	Steed
Horton	Natcher	Steiger, Ariz.
Hosmer	Nedzi	Steiger, Wis.
Howard	Nelsen	Stratton
Hull	Nichols	Sullivan
Hungate	Nix	Symington
Hunt	Obey	Talcott
Hutchinson	O'Hara	Taylor
Ichord	O'Konski	Teague, Calif.
Jacobs	Olsen	Thompson, N.J.
Jarman	O'Neal, Ga.	Thomson, Wis.
Johnson, Calif.	O'Neill, Mass.	Tiernan
Johnson, Pa.	Passman	Udall
Jones, N.C.	Patman	Ullman
Karh	Patten	Vander Jagt
Kastenmeyer	Perkins	Vank
Kazen	Pettis	Vigorito
Kee	Pike	Waggoner
Kleppe	Pirnie	Waldie
Kluczynski	Poage	Wampler
Koch	Podell	Watts
Kyl	Poff	Whalley
Kyros	Pollock	Whitehurst
Langen	Preyer, N.C.	Whitten
Latta	Price, Ill.	Widmall
Leggett	Pucinski	Williams
Lennon	Quillen	Wilson, Bob
Lloyd	Rallsback	Winn
Long, Md.	Randall	Wolf
Lukens	Rarick	Wright
McClory	Reid, Ill.	Wyatt
McCloskey	Reid, N.Y.	Wydler
McClure	Reifel	Wyle
McDade	Reuss	Wyman
McDonald,	Rhodes	Yates
Mich.	Roberts	Zablocki
McEwen	Robison	Zion
		Zwach

NAYS—1

Teague, Tex.

NOT VOTING—115

Anderson,	Dowdy	Lowenstein
Calif.	Edwards, Ala.	Lujan
Anderson, Ill.	Edwards, La.	McCarthy
Anderson,	Esch	McCulloch
Tenn.	Fallon	Macdonald,
Ayres	Feighan	Mass.
Berry	Findley	MacGregor
Blackburn	Flynt	Melcher
Elatnik	Fountain	Meskill
Brock	Fraser	Miller, Calif.
Broomfield	Frey	Monagan
Buchanan	Friedel	Morton
Burke, Fla.	Fulton, Tenn.	Murphy, N.Y.
Burleson, Tex.	Gialmo	Ottinger
Burton, Utah	Gibbons	Pelly
Bush	Goldwater	Pepper
Button	Hagan	Philbin
Cabell	Hall	Pickle
Carey	Hanna	Powell
Casey	Hansen, Wash.	Price, Tex.
Celler	Hays	Pryor, Ark.
Chisholm	Hébert	Purcell
Ciancy	Hicks	Qule
Corman	Jonas	Rees
Cowger	Jones, Ala.	Riegle
Cramer	Jones, Tenn.	Rivers
Daddario	Keith	Rogers, Colo.
Davis, Ga.	King	Roudebush
Dawson	Kuykendall	Rousselot
de la Garza	Landgrebe	St Germain
Delaney	Landrum	Scherle
Dent	Long, La.	Schneebeil

Schwengel	Stuckey	White
Sebellius	Taft	Wiggins
Sisk	Thompson, Ga.	Wilson,
Skubitz	Tunney	Charles H.
Snyder	Van Deerlin	Wold
Stephens	Watson	Yatron
Stokes	Weicker	Young
Stubblefield	Whalen	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Bureson of Texas with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Price of Texas.
Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. Kuykendall.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Ottlinger with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Wold.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Taft.

Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. McCarthy.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Weicker.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Melcher with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Rousselot.
Mr. White with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Whalen.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Findley.

Mr. Young with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Yatron with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Button.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Lowenstein with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Schneebeli.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Sebellius.
Mr. Pickle with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Hicks with Mr. Casey.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Pepper.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Hogan with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Celler with Mr. King.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Keith.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Stokes.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Stuckey.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Rees.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. CRANE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1129, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 2264.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. STAGGERS: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2264 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 11913, as passed, as follows:

That this Act may be cited as the "Communicable Disease Control Amendments of 1970."

GRANTS FOR COMMUNICABLE DISEASE CONTROL

SEC. 2. Section 317 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247b) is amended to read as follows:

"COMMUNICABLE DISEASE CONTROL AND VACCINATION ASSISTANCE

"Sec. 317. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and \$90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, to enable the Secretary to make grants to States and, with the approval of the State health authority, to political subdivisions or instrumentalities of the States under this subsection. In the award of such grants the Secretary shall give consideration to the relative extent of the problems relating to one or more of the diseases referred to in subsection (b) (1) and to the levels of performance in preventing and controlling such diseases. Such grants may be used for meeting the cost of communicable disease control programs, including the cost of studies to determine the communicable disease control needs of communities and the means of best meeting such needs.

"(b) For the purposes of this subsection—

"(1) a 'communicable disease control program' means a program which is designed and conducted so as to contribute to national protection against tuberculosis, venereal disease, rubella, measles, Rh disease, poliomyelitis, diphtheria, tetanus, whooping cough or other communicable diseases which are transmitted from State to State, are amenable to reduction, and which are determined by the Secretary on the recommendation of the National Advisory Health Council to be of national significance, and

"(2) the term 'State' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia.

"(c) Payments under this section may be made in advance on the basis of estimates or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of underpayments, or overpayments, in such installments and on such terms and conditions as the Secretary finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(d) The Secretary, at the request of a recipient of a grant under this section, may reduce such grant by the fair market value of any supplies (including vaccines and other preventive agents), or equipment furnished to such recipient and by the amount of the pay, allowances, traveling expenses, and any other costs in connection with the detail of an officer or employee to the recipient when the furnishing of such supplies or equipment, or of the detail of such officer or employee (as the case may be), is for the convenience of and at the request of such recipient and for the purpose of carrying out the program with respect to which the grant under this section is made. The amount by which any such grant is so reduced shall be available for payment by the Secretary of the costs incurred in furnishing the supplies, equipment, or personal services on which the reduction of such grant is based, but such amount shall be deemed a part of the grant to such recipient and shall, for the purposes of subsection (c), be deemed to have been paid to such agency.

"(e) Nothing in this section shall limit or otherwise restrict the use of funds which are granted to a State or to a political subdivision of a State under other provisions of this Act or other Federal law and which are available for the conduct of communicable disease control programs from being used in connection with programs assisted through grants under this section.

"(f) The Secretary shall submit an annual report to the President for submission to the Congress on the effectiveness of activities assisted under this section in preventing and controlling communicable diseases.

"(g) Nothing in this section shall be construed to require any State or any political subdivision or instrumentality of a State to have a communicable disease control or vaccination program which would require any person who objects to such treatment to be treated, or to have any child or ward of his treated.

The motion was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 11913) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the two bills just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 9804, YUMA MESA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, ARIZONA

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1187 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1187

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9804) to amend Public Law 394, Eighty-fourth Congress, to authorize the construction of supplemental irrigation facilities for Yuma Mesa Irrigation District, Arizona. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 9804, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 2882, and it shall then be in order to consider the said Senate bill in the House.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to this rule and I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to provide authority for the Secretary of the Interior to construct supplemental irrigation facilities for the Yuma Mesa Irrigation and Drainage District in Arizona.

This project was originally authorized in 1937 and reauthorized in 1947. Before it was constructed part of the lands involved were converted to military uses. In 1956 the construction of additional drainage facilities were authorized.

The Yuma Mesa project, and several other similar projects use the Gila Gravity Main Canal. During periods of peak use the Yuma Mesa systems do not receive adequate water. This can be eased by the construction of a regulatory storage system which can hold water for the Yuma Mesa system and deliver it at times of lower flow levels.

Construction of this storage system is estimated to cost \$510,000. This will require the installation of an impervious lining on the sides and bottom of an existing excavation and will create a reservoir with a capacity of approximately 1.115 acre-feet. From repayments for water use, the Secretary currently has available \$384,000, which sum is available for accommodating future drainage requirements under the terms of the original act.

The bill will permit the use of this sum for the construction of the storage system by authorizing the use of the funds for "irrigation works and facilities," thus broadening the purposes for which they may be used. The Federal cost of the project will be \$384,000. The remaining cost, some \$129,000 will be borne by the Yuma Mesa Irrigation and Drainage District and its water works.

The bill is supported by the Department of Interior. There are no minority views.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to this rule and reserve the remainder of my time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 16987, MINOT EXTENSION, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT, NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1189 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1189

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R.

16987) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Minot extension of the Garrison diversion unit of the Missouri River Basin project in North Dakota, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 16987, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 2808, and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 16987 as passed by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to this rule and I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain the facilities to divert and deliver water from the Garrison diversion unit to the city of Minot, S. Dak.

When the Garrison diversion unit was authorized in 1965, the city of Minot was included as one of the major participants in the municipal water function, with an ultimate demand for over 20,000 acre-feet of water annually. At that time the authorizing legislation did not include the facilities to divert and deliver the water to the city's storage facilities.

The city's water source is the Souris River and neighboring wells. Today, in peak use periods, the city and the nearby Air Force base must ration their water consumption. This is a totally inadequate situation, particularly with respect to future area development. The city cannot raise the money necessary for the construction itself because of the poor market conditions with respect to municipal bonds.

The bill authorizes appropriations totaling \$12,910,000, based on January 1969 cost estimates.

Two pumping stations will be built to lift water from the Velva Canal and carry it some 10.5 miles to the Livingston Reservoir, from where the water will be conveyed to the city's treatment plant. This phase of the work will cost \$10,830,000.

The remaining authorization, \$2,080,000 will be used to build a pipeline from a recently discovered well field to the city's treatment plant.

All Federal costs of construction will be repaid by the city of Minot within 50 years.

The Department of Interior supports the bill. There are no minority views.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7521, RIVERTON EXTENSION, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1185 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1185

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7521) to reauthorize the Riverton extension unit, Missouri River Basin project, to include therein the entire Riverton Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 7521, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 434, and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 7521 as passed by the House.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to this rule and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to this rule.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to consolidate several related but separate projects into a single entity—the Riverton extension unit. This will place the unit, a part of the Missouri River Basin project, on a sound economic base.

New construction authorized by the bill totals \$11,103,000 based on July 1, 1969, cost estimates. Also authorized are fish and wildlife enhancement measures, totaling \$1,013,000. Funds will be used for land and habitat improvement for upland game and migratory waterfowl. Thus the total Federal cost is \$12,116,000 at July 1969 price levels.

The project has a good cost-benefit ratio, determined to be 1.41 to 1 in direct benefits.

The Department of the Interior supports the bill. The Bureau of the Budget questions whether this bill is the best way to assist a financially troubled rec-

lamation project and raises questions of public policy based upon the issue.

There are no minority views.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10874, GULF ISLANDS NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1197 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1197

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10874) to provide for the establishment of the Gulf Islands National Seashore, in the States of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi, for the recognition of certain historic values at Fort San Carlos, Fort Redoubt, Fort Barrancas, and Fort Pickens in Florida and Fort Massachusetts in Mississippi, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to this rule and reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. This will mean the adoption of four rules on four bills. I do not know how many more rules we will adopt, or whether it is planned to run until midnight or 2 o'clock tomorrow morning in order to dispose of the legislation made in order by these rules. Are we going to run into the night or does the gentleman happen to know?

Mr. BOLLING. I am not in a position to advise the gentleman how late the House will run but I do understand that we will attempt to adopt two more rules after the four that I hope we will have adopted when we finish this one.

Mr. GROSS. That will be six or seven rules.

Mr. BOLLING. That will be six. Then I understand that the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will take up the matters made in order by these rules. I also understand with the possible exception of one there is little or no controversy on any of these matters. When the chairman and the

other members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs appeared before the Committee on Rules there was little or no controversy. I think there was no controversy on five of these bills and there was no controversy on the rule on the sixth but there was a little controversy on the sixth bill. My understanding is that it is hoped by the leadership on both sides and by the members of the committee handling the bill that they will be able to handle not only these rules but also these bills in an expeditious fashion this afternoon thus completing the schedule on the whip notice and not making it necessary to meet tomorrow.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield. I want to commend him for his explicit speech in behalf of adopting a long series of rules. Does the Committee on Rules plan to take a vacation the rest of the day after having disposed of these rules in lump-sum fashion?

Mr. BOLLING. With the good will of the gentleman, after we have adopted these rules I would hope we would not have to call up any further rules.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 10874 is to establish a new national seashore on the Gulf of Mexico, to be known as the Gulf Islands National Seashore. It will be a prime recreation area for a seven-State region—Mississippi, Florida, Louisiana, Alabama, Georgia, Arkansas, and Tennessee—where some 23 million people reside.

The Department of Interior favors the bill.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 13001, NAVAJO INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1188 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1188

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13001) to amend the Act of June 13, 1962 (76 Stat. 96), with respect to the Navajo Indian irrigation project. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 13001, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 203, and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike

out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 13001 as passed by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING), is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Again, Mr. Speaker, I may say that there is no opposition to this rule that I know of, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to permit revision of the previously authorized Navajo Indian irrigation project on the tribe's reservation in New Mexico.

The project was originally approved in 1962. It authorized an irrigation project covering 110,030 acres at a cost of \$135 million. The plan also called for the irrigation of lands in eight adjacent, federally owned townships not a part of the reservation. Provision was made for purchase of these lands by the tribe at their appraised value.

Subsequently, these federally owned lands have been found to be unsuitable for an irrigation project. Alternative lands have been identified which are also adjacent to that part of the Navajo reservation which will be irrigated.

The bill provides for a revision in the original irrigation project. The federally owned lands which are adjacent to the reservation and suitable for an irrigation project are made available to the Navajos to be held in trust by the Secretary of the Interior for the Navajos upon payment of the appraised value.

The bill also provides that current grazing permitholders on the federally owned lands involved, if they are taken for use by the irrigation project, will be compensated by the Navajos for any permanent improvements made by such permitholders.

Finally, the bill increases the existing authorization from \$135 million to a new level of \$206 million. The earlier figure was based upon 1961 prices, whereas the new authorization is based upon costs as of April 1970. This new cost figure is \$178 million. The additional \$28 million is made available to cover the change in plans necessitated by the expected transfer of Federal lands to the Navajos, which will be irrigated as part of the project.

The Department of the Interior supports the bill as reported.

There are no minority views.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 9306, APOSTLE ISLANDS NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 1186, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1186

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9306) to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. After the passage of H.R. 9306, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 621, and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 9306 as passed by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING), is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, again I know of no opposition to this rule, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Missouri, I do not know of any opposition to this rule. There is some opposition to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to authorize the purchase of land and the development of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore along Lake Superior in Wisconsin.

The area is an excellent one for a national lakeshore, containing beautiful beaches, 20 islands in the lake on which many animal species live, and much geological evidence of the glacial period, including caves, caverns, and arches carved out thousands of years ago.

The area of the park will include 20 islands totaling 39,500 acres and 2,470 acres of land in a strip some 10 miles long along the shoreline. The Indian lands in the area, owned by the Red Cliff Chippewas as a part of their reservation lands are not included as the Indians strongly object. Some lands once owned by the Indians and within the boundaries of the reservation are included in the proposed park. These lands are now owned privately by non-Indians and total over 1,500 acres of the almost 2,500 along the lakeshore.

The bill authorizes appropriations of \$4,250,000 for land acquisition and \$5 million for park development.

The Department of the Interior and the administration do not support the legislation.

Dissenting views are signed by a bipartisan group of five members opposing the legislation. They believe the bill violates the Indian treaty signed with the Red Cliff Chippewa Tribe in 1854 and also the implementing Executive order of 1856 which established the Red Cliff Reservation. Further, they point out that the park, as contemplated by the bill, does not comply with the primary criteria for the establishment of the lakeshore as a national recreation area.

They point out that the park will include 1,541 acres of land included in the original treaty and Executive order. The Indians strongly oppose the park because they want to repurchase this land and return it to reservation use. The park will also greatly alter the way of life of the Indians as it brings area development and many visitors to it. These members believe that nothing should be done until the Indians' rights are protected as guaranteed by the treaty of 1854.

They also note that the proposed park does not comply with the criteria for recreational area establishment and development in that it is not within 250 miles of at least 30 million people; it is within 250 miles of only 5 million.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, at this point I will be brief, and I will be explicit. There is opposition to this bill.

I would not want the pressures of the moment to prevent a thorough consideration of this bill today, even though it is the last one on the schedule.

I am opposing this bill because I think it includes an injustice to the people of the Indian nations of the United States. This opposition by the Indians is expressed in these telegrams which I hold in my hand. They are from:

Lorette V. Ellis, Minneapolis regional vice president of the National Congress of American Indians and Jean Taylor, president, Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council, Inc.

Walter L. Moffett, second vice president, Affiliated Tribes of the Northwest Kamiah Idaho.

The National Indian Youth Council, Gerald Wilkinson, executive director.

Buffalo Tiger, chairman, Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida.

Jacob Thompson, president, Oneida Indian Nation of New York State.

Purcell Powless, chairman, Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin, Inc.

Donald Wright, Alaska area vice president, National Congress of American Indians.

Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council, governing body of 10 tribes—the Oneidas, the Winnebagos, the Stockbrider Munnesees, the Forest County Potawatamies, the Mole Lake Lac Du Flambeau, La Courte Orille, St. Croix, Bad River, and Red Cliff Bands of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians.

Mr. Speaker, also to inform the Members of this body, I will say that when this bill does come to us for consideration

later today, I will offer an opportunity for a quicker consideration of the bill through an amendment which would take from the bill all of the mainland areas which are included. The inclusion is objected to by the Indians.

This amendment would leave a lakeshore area, an area consisting of islands, totaling about 39,000 acres. If that amendment is adopted, and if we can have an agreement on that amendment, we need not take a great deal of time.

I say again, Mr. Speaker, I believe in view of the interest of the Indians in this legislation, it should have thorough consideration and all Members who are present here should hear the argument concerning the bill.

WHY SHOULD CASSIUS CLAY BE PERMITTED TO FIGHT FOR PROFIT WHEN HE REFUSES TO FIGHT FOR HIS COUNTRY?

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MICHEL was allowed to speak out of order and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I read with disgust today the article in the Washington Post concerning the upcoming heavyweight fight of this country's infamous draft dodger, Cassius Clay.

The article said that Mr. Clay was out of shape, overweight, and winded. No doubt this comes about from his desperate and concerted efforts to stay out of the military service while thousands of patriotic young men are fighting and dying in Vietnam.

I wonder how the Justice Department would deal with these fine young Americans should they suddenly develop reservations about serving in the Armed Forces? Not having Mr. Clay's money or surrounded as he is by a battery of self-serving lawyers, I am sure the Department would have no trouble in seeing that a speedy trial and sentence was reached.

As it is, to quote an old proverb, every ass thinks himself worthy to stand with the king's horses. In other words, Cassius Clay cannot hold a candle to the average American boy who is willing to defend his country in perilous times.

Apparently Mr. Clay feels himself entitled to the full protection of the law yet does not feel he has to sacrifice anything to preserve the institutions that protect him. What a mess this country would be in if everyone felt this way. Heavyweight champion or not, Cassius Clay does not deserve the special treatment he seems to be getting at the hands of the Justice Department. Nor should the State of Georgia allow him to feather his own nest by fighting in Atlanta. Anyone who shows a complete disregard for our institutions should not be treated to the hospitality of a city which has always shown a great pride and concern for our American way of life.

Finally, I urge the Justice Department to proceed with deliberate haste to bring Mr. Clay's case to an end. At the end of this fiscal year there were 3,899 pending draft evasion cases involving 3,923 defendants in the Justice Department. This is indeed a heavy caseload, but to allow cases like Cassius Clay's to drag out for years is inexcusable and only tends to

destroy the confidence our citizens have in our system of justice.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

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

The question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENTAL IRRIGATION FACILITIES FOR THE YUMA MESA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, ARIZONA

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 9804) to amend Public Law 394, 84th Congress, to authorize the construction of supplemental irrigation facilities for the Yuma Mesa Irrigation District, Ariz., and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 9804

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act of January 28, 1956 (70 Stat. 5, Public Law 394, Eighty-fourth Congress), is amended by inserting after the word "buildings" the words "and irrigation works and facilities".

Sec. 2. Section 4 of the Act of January 28, 1956, is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding "but the contract executed on or prior to such date may be amended to include works authorized after such date by amendments to section 2."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 9804 is to enable the Secretary of the Interior to use funds heretofore authorized for the construction of drainage works for the construction of a small regulatory reservoir. Such facility is badly needed for effective operation of the Yuma Mesa Division of the Gila project.

The Yuma Mesa Division is completely operational. It receives its water supply from the Colorado River through a shared canal system with other projects in the area of Yuma. There are times when the common canal and the Yuma Mesa's pumping plant can not deliver enough water to satisfy peak demands of the crops, which are mostly citrus. A reservoir of 1,100 acre-feet which can be filled during slack periods will contain enough water to supplement adequately the delivery capability of the existing works; thereby providing an adequate water supply and realization of the full potential of the program.

The act of January 28, 1956, which authorized the existing repayment contract, authorized \$1,350,000 to be appropriated for construction of certain specifically identified project facilities and drains. The regulatory reservoir that is now needed to offset the capacity bottleneck was not included among the items enumerated in the act.

All of the funds authorized by the act of January 28, 1956, have been appropriated and expended except some \$384,000 being reserved for future drainage construction. Under the terms of H.R. 9804, the Secretary will be authorized to use these funds toward building the reservoir. Thereafter, if drainage problems arise, the Yuma Mesa Irrigation and Drainage District will cope with them at its own expense.

The reservoir that is now contemplated will be built by placing an impervious earth lining on the side slopes and bottom of a large excavation from which the Arizona Highway Department removed earth materials for highway construction. The right-of-way is in Federal ownership and no lands will need be acquired.

The construction cost is now estimated at \$510,000 and the Irrigation and Drainage District will contribute funds to cover costs in excess of \$384,000. Actually, this bill does not involve any new Federal expenditures since the Federal share would otherwise be spent for drainage construction over a period of time. The bill will have the effect of expediting in time the expenditure of this amount, however.

There is no local opposition to the measure, and no opposition in our committee to its passage. The program involves no new or unusual problems from the standpoint of water rights, compacts, court decrees, or from its impact on environmental values. I wholeheartedly commend the measure to the House and recommend its immediate adoption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

(On request of Mr. UDALL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ASPINALL was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I am glad to yield to my friend from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. As the author of this bill and the gentleman in whose district the project lies, I wish to thank the chairman of our committee for his very clear-cut explanation of the bill, and I want to state my strong support for it.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation to authorize the construction of supplemental irrigation facilities for the Yuma Mesa Irrigation District in Arizona.

The Yuma Mesa Irrigation and Drainage District is served water through the Gila Gravity Main Canal from the Imperial Dam on the Colorado River. Nearly all of the 19,970 irrigable lands in the district are planted in high value citrus, and the district is experiencing difficulty in delivering sufficient water to this acreage, particularly during the hot summer season. The irrigation district has expressed the need for a regulating reservoir which would enable the district to meet its critical demands for water.

The Yuma Mesa Irrigation District has located its proposed regulating reser-

voir in the form of a large excavated barrow pit. This pit was utilized by the Arizona Highway Department in the construction of an interstate highway. The barrow pit is located adjacent to the district's main irrigation artery and with appropriate modification could be converted to a balancing reservoir with an estimated capacity of 1,115 acre-feet of water.

The act of January 28, 1956, which authorized the Secretary of the Interior to execute a repayment contract with the district and to construct drainage facilities and works, does not contain the authority needed to construct the reservoir. H.R. 9804 will provide the authority necessary to construct the reservoir by amending section 2 of the 1956 act to include "irrigation works and facilities."

The preliminary cost estimate for modifying the barrow pit into a reservoir by lining the pit with soil cement to prevent seepage, and to equip the reservoir with appropriate pumping and conveyance facilities, is approximately \$510,000. These costs will be met by permitting the use of \$384,000 which was reserved but unexpended for construction of drainage facilities under the 1956 act. Any remaining costs or additional funds will be the responsibility of the Yuma Mesa Irrigation and Drainage District.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 9804.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAYLOR

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: Page 1, line 6, change the period to a comma and insert the following: "and at the end of said section 2 delete the period and insert the following proviso: 'Provided, That all identifiable flows of water from works and facilities authorized in this Act shall be periodically inspected and treated for the purpose of abating pollution and improving water quality in such manner as determined by the Secretary of the Interior.'"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the amendment I would like to see in this bill, but I am a realist. I realize that I cannot get this amendment in this bill, but I am going to put into the RECORD at this point an explanation of what I think this amendment would do.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to carry out the congressional intent to abate water pollution and improve our environment. This Nation is on the threshold of a major attack on water pollution. The Council on Environmental Quality in its recent report recommended that a strong and consistent Federal policy should be developed to control water pollution and insure effective enforcement of water quality standards.

The place to begin is here in our consideration of legislation authorizing Federal water resource developments—be they large or small. And, the time to begin is now. This is essentially what the amendment I have offered does, by writing into basic law the requirement that all identifiable flows of water from works

and facilities authorized in this Federal project shall be inspected and treated for the purpose of abating water pollution and improving water quality.

This is not a complex amendment. The amendment merely requires: First, that the flows of water be identified from the works and facilities authorized in the act, if they cannot be identified then there is nothing to be done; and, second, if the flows of water can be identified, the amendment requires that the water flow be inspected for water pollution. If water pollution is found then the amendment requires that the water flows be treated to abate the pollution and improve the water quality. All this is to be done in such manner as is determined by the Secretary of the Interior. If the Secretary of the Interior does not have the money or manpower within his Department or the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, then the Secretary, I am certain, will be more than willing to request more money and manpower from the Congress.

I am aware that there are those who will rise in opposition to this amendment and propose arguments against its adoption on the basis that this amendment has no place in this little project. I would point out to my colleagues that this Congress passed Public Law 91-190, commonly known as the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. The amendment which I have offered is merely a step, a small step, in carrying out the congressional declaration of a national environmental policy. I would also say to my colleagues to beware of those who clamor for the improvement of our environment, so long as it is not required in their own backyard.

Improvement of our environment, abating water pollution, and improving water quality are all part of the same problem. If we in the Congress are to carry out our commitment to improve the environment then we must begin by requiring that Federal water resource developments, of large, small or medium size, be continually monitored for the purpose of abating water pollution and improving water quality.

If we are to have a national policy on the environment, then the Federal Government should set the example. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAYLOR

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: Page 2, at end of line 2, insert "The Yuma-Mesa division shall be operated in such manner that identifiable return flows of water will not cause the Colorado River stream system to be in violation of water quality standards promulgated pursuant to the Water Quality Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 903)."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, at the time we had another project in Colorado, this was the formula that was agreed

upon in the conference. This is a positive action, requiring that the Secretary of the Interior and the people in the Bureau of Reclamation shall operate this project so as not to lower the quality of the water in violation of the Water Quality Act of 1965. It is a positive action which the Secretary must take, and I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, after looking over the amendment just offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, certainly we have no objection to it on this side of the aisle.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Speaker, twice I have heard it stated that this bill is not going to cost anything, but the report says:

The direct Federal cost of H.R. 9804—

What is this bill—
is \$384,000.

What I am supposed to believe?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, when the original authorization was made available, it was for \$1,350,000, and the works have been put in as stated heretofore, but they are not adequate to take care of the high peak flows of delivery of water for irrigation purposes. The bill here would authorize the construction of a re-regulating reservoir to store water in the off peak and deliver it in the peak flows to take care of the irrigation needs. This would take, \$384,000 in Federal funds to construct this particular reservoir. The amount of money of \$1,350,000 was made available for the irrigation system and the drainage system. In the event there is any deferred drainage, the district would have to make up that cost itself. At the present time the reservoir would be built in a pit used for highway purposes at a very low cost, \$510,000. The \$384,000 would be paid back by the district to the Federal Government.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman, how is this project paying out? Is it doing well?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes, as far as I know the project is meeting its commitments, and at the present time there is no problem from the standpoint of repayment.

Mr. GROSS. What is the showing as to the original cost-to-benefit ratio?

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

Mr. GROSS. I will yield to anyone who can help; yes.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, this has turned out to be one of the best projects we have ever had. This was raw desert, and it is now extremely valuable citrus land. The fact is there is a \$384,000 surplus which has been paid in by the irrigators into this account, and all we ask is the technical permission to take and use that money to build this reservoir, which will make this project more valuable.

It is not exactly fair to say there will be no initial cost to the Government. Initially the Federal Government will build this, but it will ask repayment of the cost from the district, and of that the Government already has \$384,000 which has already been paid in, and the district will cough up the other \$100,000, so in the final result there will be no cost to the Federal Government.

Mr. GROSS. We hope.

Mr. UDALL. We do not just hope. We know that.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9804 proposes a very minor amendment to Public Law 84-394, which authorized under a Federal repayment contract construction of drainage facilities by the Yuma Mesa Irrigation and Drainage District in Arizona. Yuma Mesa is one of five irrigation districts that share the Gila Main Gravity Canal, conveying water to the Yuma area from the takeout point at Imperial Dam.

When these drainage facilities were originally authorized in 1957, the water requirements of the area were substantially less than they now are. Thirteen years ago the district was principally a cotton producer; today it is planted to citrus, a crop which requires more water than cotton. To date, Yuma Mesa has only been able to meet this increased demand for water by borrowing unused capacity from neighboring districts. However, there is little reason to believe that these neighbors will continue to enjoy a water surplus indefinitely.

To meet its long-range needs, Yuma Mesa wants to build an additional reservoir where water could be stored for use during the peak summer months when the demand outstrips supply. By coincidence the Arizona State Highway Department, in the construction of U.S. Interstate 8, dug a 96-acre barrow pit immediately adjacent to the district's main "A" canal. Yuma Mesa proposes to buy this pit and employ it as a balancing reservoir, thereby solving its capacity problems.

In a search for the funds needed to make the purchase and to make necessary improvements, Yuma Mesa discovered that it still had \$384,000 in drainage moneys which were authorized under Public Law 84-394. Since this money is not needed to meet its repayment obligation to the Federal Government, the district is seeking a simple amendment to the 1957 law allowing them to apply this surplus to the cost of purchasing and improving irrigation facilities. Let me emphasize that this bill will cost the U.S. taxpayers nothing. The cost of the proposed reservoir will be paid entirely by the irrigation district.

As the Secretary of Interior points out in his report on the bill, the proposed balancing reservoir has the sole disadvantage of being located on a mesa above other irrigated land. The Secretary concludes, and I am told that all parties concur, that strict precautions against seepage must and will be taken.

The cost of this undertaking to the Yuma Mesa District will not be insubstantial even if we approve this bill today. The Bureau of Reclamation estimates costs at \$510,000, necessitating an

expenditure of more than \$100,000 of the district's private funds. If we deny Yuma Mesa the relief that it needs, the project will simply have to be abandoned.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my distinguished colleagues to approve this amendment. The Yuma Mesa District comprises nearly 20,000 acres of high value citrus whose lifeline is threatened. This need not be the case. Through a small investment of public funds, together with a substantial private contribution, we can assure an ample flow of water to these crops for years to come.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, the repayment contract was signed in the original days of the operation. It has already been signed, and it is a question whether or not the amount will be used for drainage or for a more important use, such as the building of the regulatory reservoir.

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

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

Mr. SAYLOR. The gentleman asked a question which is pertinent: What is the benefit-cost ratio for this project? If my memory serves me correctly, this is one of the best benefit-cost reclamation projects ever presented, and it is slightly in excess of 1 to 3. It is current, and the contracts that have been entered into for the repayment are up to date.

This is one of the best irrigation projects we have in the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9804, to amend the act of January 28, 1956, will make it possible for the Secretary of the Interior to utilize the funds authorized to be appropriated for the Yuma Mesa Division of the Gila project in a more useful and timely manner than can now be accomplished. The Yuma Mesa Division is a fully operational reclamation project near the City of Yuma, Ariz. It receives its water supply from the Colorado River through a system of major canals which it shares with other entities. While the canal system is adequate to deliver the water to which the Yuma Mesa Division is entitled, there are critical times in which it is impossible to receive enough water to meet peak consumptive-use requirements. The solution to this problem lies in the construction of regulatory storage that may be filled with water in off-peak periods for subsequent use in periods of high demand.

Such storage can be provided by creating a reservoir from an existing excavation by the placement of impervious lining on the bottom and side slopes. This excavation was created by the removal of construction materials for use in nearby highway construction. The site is on lands controlled by the project and there is no land acquisition problem. Estimates of the cost of this activity at current-day prices is about \$510,000. It is anticipated that the construction work will be performed by the Bureau of Reclamation utilizing reimbursable funds in the amount of \$384,000 with the remainder being contributed by the Yuma Mesa Irrigation and Drainage District.

The Federal share of this program is already covered by a repayment contract between the United States and the Irrigation and Drainage District under which the district agreed to repay \$1,350,000 to be expended by the United States for the construction of certain designated facilities. The act of January 28, 1956, authorizing the repayment contract set forth the facilities which might be constructed under its terms. A reorganizing reservoir of the character needed was not included in the list of designated facilities and this legislation is needed to include the reservoir among the authorized facilities.

The Federal funds that will be used for this program are the unapplied balance of the \$1,350,000 included in the original contract. This amount is now reserved for future drainage construction, if required. When the money is expended for the reservoir, this irrigation district will assume responsibility for future drainage. In this sense, H.R. 9804 actually does not involve any increase in Federal expenditures in excess of the obligations already committed by the repayment contract now in force.

In the hearings before our Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, we found the legislation fully supported by the executive branch and the local interests from the State of Arizona. The measure was approved unanimously by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs after full discussion. The program poses no problems of water supply and has no adverse environmental effects.

For these reasons, I urge the full support of all Members for H.R. 9804.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1187, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 2882, to amend Public Law 394, 84th Congress, to authorize the construction of supplemental irrigation facilities for the Yuma Mesa Irrigation District, Arizona.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 2882

An act to amend Public Law 394, Eighty-fourth Congress, to authorize the construction of supplemental irrigation facilities for the Yuma Mesa Irrigation District, Arizona

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act of January 28, 1956 (70 Stat. 5, Public Law 394, Eighty-fourth Congress), is amended by inserting after the word "buildings" the words "and irrigation works and facilities".

Sec. 2. Section 4 of the Act of January 28, 1956, is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding "but

the contract executed on or prior to such date may be amended to include works authorized after such date by amendments to section 2."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of California moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2882 and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 9804, as passed, as follows:

That section 2 of the Act of January 28, 1956 (70 Stat. 5, Public Law 394, Eighty-fourth Congress), is amended by inserting after the word "buildings" the words "and irrigation work and facilities".

Sec. 2. Section 4 of the Act of January 28, 1956, is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding "but the contract executed on or prior to such date may be amended to include works authorized after such date by amendments to section 2." The Yuma-Mesa division shall be operated in such manner that identifiable return flows of water will not cause the Colorado River stream system to be in violation of water quality standards promulgated pursuant to the Water Quality Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 903).

The motion was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 9804) was laid on the table.

MINOT EXTENSION, GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT, NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 16987) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Minot extension of the Garrison diversion unit of the Missouri River Basin project in North Dakota, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 16987

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Minot extension of the Garrison diversion unit in North Dakota under the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902; 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto) for the principal purposes of conveying, regulating, and furnishing water made available through facilities of the Garrison diversion unit for use by the city of Minot and other communities for municipal and industrial purposes; conserving and developing fish and wildlife resources; and enhancing outdoor recreation opportunities.

Sec. 2. The Secretary is authorized to construct appropriate portions of the Minot extension to assist in the interim delivery of water from ground water sources prior to the availability of water through the facilities of the Garrison diversion unit.

Sec. 3. (a) Costs of the project, or any unit or stage thereof, allocated to municipal water supply, shall be repayable, with interest, by the municipal water users over a period of not more than fifty years from the date that water is first delivered for that purpose, pursuant to contracts with municipal corporations or other organizations, as defined in subsection 2(g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187). Such contracts shall be precedent to the commencement of construction of the project. Contracts may be entered into with water users' organizations pursuant to the provisions of this Act without regard to the last sentence of subsection 9(c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187).

(b) Expenditures for the Minot extension may be made without regard to the soil survey and land classification requirements of the Interior Department Appropriations Act of 1954 (67 Stat. 266).

(c) The interest rate used for computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance of the reimbursable costs of the Minot extension shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction on the extension is commenced, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue.

(d) The Secretary is authorized to transfer to a qualified contracting entity or entities the care, operation, and maintenance of the project works, and, if such transfer is made, to credit annually against the contractor's repayment obligation that portion of the year's joint operation and maintenance costs which, if the United States had continued to operate the project, would have been allocated to fish and wildlife and recreation purposes. Prior to assuming care, operation, and maintenance of the project works the contracting entity or entities shall be obligated to operate them in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary of the Interior with respect to fish and wildlife and recreation.

Sec. 4. The conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources and the enhancement of recreation opportunities in connection with the Minot extension shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Water Projects Recreation Act (79 Stat. 213).

Sec. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated for the construction of the Minot extension the sum of \$12,150,000 (January 1969 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the type of construction involved.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 16987 is a bill to authorize new project construction and is the last of the new reclamation project authorizations that we will be bringing out in this Congress. The Members will remember, I am sure, that I outlined a program of authorizations for this Congress aggregating about \$150 to \$175 million. We believed then, as we do now, that we should keep the machinery of project authorizations operating, but that the dollar volume should be carefully managed so that the Bureau of Reclamation can make some in-road into its backlog of authorized projects.

This program is badly needed and can be accommodated without appreciable impact on the backlog. It is a two-stage development having a total construction

cost estimated at \$12,910,000. The first stage of \$2,080,000 is the only part that imposes an early budgetary demand, since the second stage can be deferred for several years, as I will explain later.

The first stage consists of a pipeline and pumping plant to deliver water from a well field about 7 miles to the central treatment plant of the city of Minot, N. Dak. The city will drill and equip the wells and install a collection system to deliver the water to a central point. The groundwater to be developed has only recently been discovered and tested out. It is sufficient to overcome the shortages the city now has and to provide for a few years of increased demand.

Within 6 to 10 years, depending on the rate of load growth, the city will need stage two of this project. At a cost of \$10,830,000 a pipeline will be built from the Velva Canal of the authorized Garrison development to a reservoir at a site on Livingston Creek about two miles from the city. Here a holding reservoir will be built for storing water for peak demands and for winter needs. A pipeline spur will be built from the reservoir to intercept the pipeline constructed for the first stage. After the second stage goes into operation, the first stage will be retired to emergency standby.

Livingston Reservoir will be multiple purpose in the sense that it will be valuable for fish and wildlife and recreation. Being situated near the population center, being located out on the prairies, and being filled to capacity largely throughout the summer, it will have heavy utilization. The plan, therefore, includes some recreation development.

Except for nonreimbursable fish and wildlife and recreation costs, of \$2,046,000 as determined by the current statutory formula, all of the costs will be repaid with interest. The city of Minot will repay the water supply costs and the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District will take care of the fish and wildlife and recreation obligations.

Since the Minot extension does not benefit irrigation, there is no cost allocated to that purpose. Thus we are not confronted here with any question of financial assistance, acreage limitations, surplus crops or any of the other issues that sometimes bother Members about reclamation projects.

The project has a good benefit-cost ratio of 1.93 to 1.0 at 4 $\frac{3}{8}$ -percent interest; there is no local opposition of which we are aware and the bill is strongly supported by our committee. Water rights are in order under the laws and procedures of the State of North Dakota and the project has no adverse environmental effects. In fact, the introduction of high quality Missouri River water into the Souris River Basin is calculated to have a very beneficial effect on the salinity of the water resources of this basin and will go a long way in resolving the conflicts which have existed between wildlife interests and commercial interest over water supply and water quality issues.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fairly small, albeit a very important project. It has been most carefully planned and analyzed. It meets all of the tests of law and policy

and, in terms of public investments, must rank high among the developmental opportunities that have come to the House in recent years. I confidently request all Members to join with me in effecting speedy passage of this most desirable measure.

Mr. Speaker, here again the reason why this legislation comes up as it does under a rule but also being considered in the House as if it were in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union is because of an amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Minot extension of the Garrison diversion unit of the Missouri River Basin project in the State of North Dakota.

The city of Minot, N. Dak., has experienced difficulty in meeting its immediate demands for municipal and industrial water. The present sources are not adequate to meet peak demands and during drought periods, serious consideration is given to water rationing. The city's existing source of supply from the Minot aquifer and the Souris River cannot be relied upon to meet the continual and growing water requirements.

The principal purpose of H.R. 16987 is to provide an interim supplemental water supply to the city of Minot and surrounding area to meet its critical short-term needs from the nearby Sunde aquifer and to develop a more dependable water supply by diverting water from the Velva Canal of the Garrison diversion unit to meet the city's long-range municipal and industrial water requirements in the future.

Construction of the Minot extension will involve two phases of development. The first phase will be the conveyance of the ground water supply from the nearby Sunde aquifer to the city's treatment plant. The principal features of this phase of development are a pumping plant near the aquifer, a pipeline leading from the pumping plant to the city's treatment plant. The second phase of development which will be required in 6 to 10 years involves the diversion of water from the Velva Canal of the Garrison diversion unit to the city's water treatment plant. The principal features of this phase will include the pipeline from the Velva Canal to the Livingston Reservoir, the Livingston Dam and Reservoir, two pumping stations and a pipeline to convey water from the reservoir to the city's water treatment plant. This second phase of development will also provide for fish and wildlife enhancement and recreational opportunities.

The total project cost of the Minot extension is estimated at \$17,413,000. Construction costs on the first phase of development are estimated at \$2,080,000 and the second phase of development is estimated to cost \$10,830,000 plus a cash assignment of \$4,503,000 from the Garrison diversion unit representing a pro rata share of the municipal and industrial water supply allocation in that

project. These project costs are allocated among the project purposes; \$14,779,000 for municipal and industrial water, and \$2,634,000 for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement. Of the estimated total project costs of \$17,413,000, approximately \$15,370,000 or 88 percent is reimbursable with interest.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 16987.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I will be happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. KLEPPE).

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in 1965 Congress authorized the Garrison diversion unit of the Missouri River Basin project in North Dakota primarily to provide municipal and industrial water to various communities in north central North Dakota.

One of the major cities included in the municipal water aspect was Minot; however, the authorization to extend the Garrison diversion unit did not cover the facilities required to divert and deliver water from the major canals of the unit to Minot.

The purpose of H.R. 16987, legislation I sponsored along with my colleague from North Dakota, will authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Minot extension of the Garrison diversion unit.

Minot, N. Dak., has been faced with a critical water supply problem and the city government has been considering the necessity of instituting the rationing of water. As one of the larger urban centers in North Dakota, Minot is the trade and service center for the west and central portions of the State. Minot's economy is rooted in agriculture and it is also the site of Minot Air Force Base, a permanent defense installation dependent on the city for its water supply. The present water service is from the Souris River and local aquifers reliant on the Souris River. The city's peak needs are not sufficiently met by these sources and they would be totally incapable of meeting the city's needs in the immediate future.

Because time has been of the essence, I wish at this point to express my sincere appreciation to a number of individuals in this body who have been instrumental in the progress of this legislation.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON) concluded hearings on H.R. 16987 in record time and favorably reported the legislation to the full committee.

The able chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL) realized the urgency of the situation in Minot and guided the progress of this legislation.

The ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) was instrumental in establishing the relationship of the Minot extension to the overall quality of the human environment, particularly with a view toward its effect upon con-

servation. His diligence and perseverance in determining that a project of this nature enhances rather than destroys the environment sets an example that all of us should follow.

The city of Minot is now extremely close to what has in the past only been an idea—the availability of a dependable supply of municipal and industrial water. Passage of H.R. 16987 by this body will hopefully signal the start of construction in the very near future.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the committee for the expeditious way in which they have handled this most important project.

H.R. 16987, a bill to authorize the Minot extension of the Garrison diversion project, is most important to the city of Minot and to the Garrison diversion unit.

The Minot extension will provide for the development of an interim water supply from a groundwater aquifer to serve the city until a water supply can be made available from the Velva Canal. Present plans contemplate that the Minot extension will be integrated with the Garrison diversion unit insofar as its operations are concerned. The total cost of the project which includes 14 miles of pipeline, two pumping plants, a dam, and 10,350 acre-foot storage reservoir, would approximate \$12 million.

The total project and assigned cost, including interest during construction, allocated to municipal and industrial water supply will be reimbursed by the city of Minot with interest.

The Garrison diversion unit, authorized back in 1965 and now under construction, will provide a plentiful supply of good water to a number of cities in the project area for municipal and industrial use. The city of Minot is the largest city of those listed in the project report as potential municipal water customers of the project and is, without question, the city in the area with the most critical water supply problem.

Very simply, this bill will provide an opportunity for early utilization of the water being diverted by the Garrison project. Its approval will result in considerable savings in local and Federal tax dollars and it will hasten vitally needed industrial and municipal water to the city of Minot.

This city of 32,000 has suffered from a water shortage, and indeed employed water rationing, nearly every year in the last decade. The recent census revealed that Minot had experienced the slowest growth rate of any of North Dakota's four major cities and this fact can certainly be blamed on the lack of water for industrial growth.

Meanwhile, Minot citizens have witnessed the growth of the Minot Air Force Base near their city, a key military installation essential to our Nation's defense. The population at the base is presently about 18,000—and the mission of this base and its personnel is dependent

on a reliable water supply from the city of Minot.

The project is greatly needed. It will result in a savings to the Federal Government over waiting until total project development and I urge my colleagues to support it.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAYLOR

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: Page 2, line 4, Strike out "opportunities." and insert: "opportunities: *Provided*, That all identifiable water flows conveyed, regulated, or furnished by or through works and facilities authorized in this Act, shall be treated for the purpose of abating pollution and improving water quality in such manner as determined by the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the same amendment which I offered to the bill which we just considered.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to carry out the congressional intent to abate water pollution and improve our environment. This Nation is on the threshold of a major attack on water pollution. The Council on Environmental Quality in its recent report recommended that a strong and consistent Federal policy should be developed to control water pollution and insure effective enforcement of water quality standards.

The place to begin is here in our consideration of legislation authorizing Federal water resource developments—be they large or small. And, the time to begin is now. This is essentially what the amendment I have offered does, by writing into basic law the requirement that all identifiable flows of water from works and facilities authorized in this Federal project shall be inspected and treated for the purpose of abating water pollution and improving water quality.

This is not a complex amendment. The amendment merely requires: First, that the flows of water be identified from the works and facilities authorized in the act, if they cannot be identified then there is nothing to be done, and second, if the flows of water can be identified, the amendment requires that the water flow be inspected for water pollution. If water pollution is found then the amendment requires that the water flows be treated to abate the pollution and improve the water quality. All this is to be done in such manner as is determined by the Secretary of the Interior. If the Secretary of the Interior does not have the money or manpower within his Department or the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, then the Secretary, I am certain, will be more than willing to request more money and manpower from the Congress.

I am aware that there are those who will rise in opposition to this amendment and propose arguments against its adoption on the basis that this amendment has no place in this little project. I would point out to my colleagues that this Congress passed Public Law 91-190, commonly known as the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. The amendment which I have offered is merely a step, a small step, in carrying

out the congressional declaration of a national environmental policy. I would also say to my colleagues to beware of those who clamor for the improvement of our environment, so long as it is not required in their own backyard.

Improvement of our environment, abating water pollution, and improving water quality are all part of the same problem. If we in the Congress are to carry out our commitment to improve the environment then we must begin by requiring that Federal water resource developments, of large, small or medium size, be continually monitored for the purpose of abating water pollution and improving water quality.

If we are to have a national policy on the environment, then the Federal Government should set the example. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAYLOR

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: on page 2 at the end of line 4, "The Minot extension to the Garrison diversion unit shall be operated in such manner that identifiable return flows of water will not cause the Souris River to be in violation of water quality standards promulgated pursuant to the Water Quality Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 903)."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the amendment which was agreed to when we discussed the amendment we had on the Narrows Unit in conference, and I am using the same language that was adopted there, and adding it to this bill.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, having read the language of the amendment just offered, we have no objection to the amendment on this side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

The amendment was agreed to.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: Page 2, line 17, strike out "precedent to" and insert "executed before".

Page 4, line 6, strike out "\$12,150,000" and insert "\$12,900,000".

Page 4, line 10, add the following sentence: "There are also authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be required for the operation and maintenance of the extension."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 16987 will authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the

Minot extension to the authorized Garrison diversion unit of the Missouri River Basin project in North Dakota. The works contemplated by this bill are necessary to enable the city of Minot to convey, regulate and utilize water for municipal and industrial purposes.

When the Garrison diversion unit was authorized by the Congress in 1965, the works did not include a means for municipalities to deliver the water from the major canals of the unit to the city systems. It was then recognized that supplementary construction would be required at a later date, even though the city of Minot has always been considered to be one of the major municipal beneficiaries of the Garrison development.

Minot is among the most important cities in the State of North Dakota. It is the trade and service center for a large portion of the State and is the site of a major Strategic Air Command base. The base relies on the city water system for all its water supplies. The town is experiencing a steady and constant growth rate and water supplies available locally from the Souris River and its tributary aquifers are no longer adequate for current needs and cannot possibly supply future growth increments. The city has been forced to curtail usage through rationing in which the air base has cooperated, has deepened its wells, and investigated all reasonable alternative means of augmenting its sources of water.

The Velva Canal of the Garrison unit will furnish such a source when it is completed and placed in service. The availability of construction funds for the works of the Garrison diversion unit has been such that a number of years will probably elapse before the Velva Canal is completed. In addition, the city's present indebtedness level and the general state of the bond market suggest serious questions of the municipality's capability to finance the interconnections to the Velva Canal when water is available from that source. All of these circumstances point to the plan of development that will be authorized by H.R. 16987 as the only viable solution to Minot's present and future water supply dilemma.

The plan envisioned by this legislation consists of two stages. The first stage has a Federal cost of only \$2,080,000 and would include pumping plants and pipelines to convey water from a newly located aquifer about seven miles to the city's central treatment plant. The city plans to drill and equip the required wells and to install, at its own expense, the facilities to accumulate the water and convey it to the project pumping plant. This development will take care of the city's needs for the next 6 to 10 years, after which the second stage of the Minot extensions will be needed.

This part of the project will have an initial cost of \$10,830,000. It will include a pipeline from the Velva Canal to the Livingston Reservoir, Livingston dam and reservoir, and a short spur outfall line from the reservoir to interconnect with the first-stage pipeline. When this stage enters service, the first stage will be placed on standby status for supplemental and emergency use.

Livingston Reservoir will be a mul-

tiple purpose facility having a very valuable fish and wildlife and recreation function. It will be within about two miles of the population concentration in Minot.

This fortunate location coupled with the fact that it can be kept filled throughout the summer season implies a heavy use by citizens of the community. Minot, being located in the heart of the North Dakota prairie country is badly in need of the fishing and other recreational opportunities afforded by a sizable body of water.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, in its hearings on this measure has been assured that water rights are in accordance with the requirements of the State of South Dakota and that there is no opposition to the legislation within the community or on the part of the agencies of State, local, or Federal Government.

The program will have a beneficial effect on environmental factors and will enhance natural values. The water to be imported into the Souris River Basin will be superior in quality to that which exists there naturally, and the increase in usable water will abate conflicts that have long existed between commercial and wildlife interests.

The project has a very fine benefit to cost ratio of 1.93 to 1.0 even at the high discount rates now being used by the executive branch for economic evaluation of water resource projects.

The development will be completely reimbursable with interest except for the write-offs to fish and wildlife and recreation authorized pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Water Projects Recreation Act. Under these authorities, the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District will pay \$588,000 plus \$19,000 interest during construction, with \$2,046,000 being nonreimbursable.

Mr. Speaker, this is critical legislation which, I am sure, all Members can support freely. The project we are considering here meets all of the tests of economic and financial analysis; it will improve and enhance the quality of life of the immediate and nearby communities; it will strengthen the utility of a major defense installation; and it will be returned substantially to the Treasury with interest. Surely, I cannot conceive of an investment in rural America that could be expected to offer more widespread return to the well-being of the general public than will be the case with this legislation. I sincerely hope that every Member will join with me in enacting it into law without delay.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1189, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is discharged from further consideration of the bill S. 2808.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF CALIFORNIA

MR. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

MR. JOHNSON of California moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2808, and insert the provisions of the bill H.R. 16987, as passed, as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Minot extension of the Garrison diversion unit in North Dakota under the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902; 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto) for the principal purposes of conveying, regulating, and furnishing water made available through facilities of the Garrison diversion unit for use by the city of Minot and other communities for municipal and industrial purposes; conserving and developing fish and wildlife resources; and enhancing outdoor recreation opportunities.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized to construct appropriate portions of the Minot extension to assist in the interim delivery of water from ground water sources prior to the availability of water through the facilities of the Garrison diversion unit.

SEC. 3. (a) Costs of the project, or any unit or stage thereof, allocated to municipal water supply, shall be repayable, with interest, by the municipal water users over a period of not more than fifty years from the date that water is first delivered for that purpose, pursuant to contracts with municipal corporations or other organizations, as defined in subsection 2(g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187). Such contracts shall be executed before the commencement of construction of the project. Contracts may be entered into with water users' organizations pursuant to the provisions of this Act without regard to the last sentence of subsection 9(c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187).

(b) Expenditures for the Minot extension may be made without regard to the soil survey and land classification requirements of the Interior Department Appropriation Act of 1954 (67 Stat. 266).

(c) The interest rate used for computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance of the reimbursable costs of the Minot extension shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction on the extension is commenced, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue.

(d) The Secretary is authorized to transfer to a qualified contracting entity or entities the care, operation, and maintenance of the project works, and, if such transfer is made, to credit annually against the contractor's repayment obligation that portion of the year's joint operation and maintenance costs which, if the United States had continued to operate the project, would have been allocated to fish and wildlife and recreation purposes. Prior to assuming care, operation, and maintenance of the project works the contracting entity or entities shall be obligated to operate them in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary of the Interior with respect to fish and wildlife and recreation.

SEC. 4. The conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources and the enhancement of recreation opportunities in connection with the Minot extension shall be in accordance with the provisions of the

Federal Water Projects Recreation Act (79 Stat. 213).

SEC. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated for the construction of the Minot extension the sum of \$12,900,000 (January 1969 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the type of construction involved. There are also authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be required for the operation and maintenance of the extension.

The motion was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 16987) was laid on the table.

REAUTHORIZING THE RIVERTON EXTENSION UNIT, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

MR. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 7521) to reauthorize the Riverton extension unit, Missouri River Basin project, to include therein the entire Riverton Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 7521

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the general plan for the Riverton extension unit, Missouri River Basin project, heretofore authorized under section 9 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887), is modified to include relief to water users, construction, betterment of works, land rehabilitation, water conservation, flood control, and silt control on the entire Riverton Federal reclamation project. As so modified the general plan is reauthorized under the designation "Riverton unit of the Missouri River Basin project".

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to negotiate and execute an amendatory repayment contract with the Midvale Irrigation District covering all lands of the Riverton unit. This contract shall replace all existing repayment contracts between the Midvale Irrigation District and the United States.

(b) The period for repayment of the construction and rehabilitation and betterment costs allocated to irrigation and assigned to be repaid by the irrigation water users shall be fifty years from and including the year in which such amendatory repayment contract is confirmed.

(c) During the period required to construct and test the adequacy of drains and other water conservation works, the rates of charge to land classes and the acreage assessable in each land class in the unit shall continue to be as established in the amendatory repayment contract with the district dated June 26, 1952; thereafter such rates of charge and assessable acreage shall be in accordance with the amortization capacity and classification of unit lands as determined by the Secretary.

(d) The district's repayment obligation

under the amendatory contract shall reflect a credit for any amounts paid by the district in reduction of its repayment obligation under previous contracts, and the repayment period of individual tracts within the district shall be reduced to reflect a credit for any amounts paid by the district in reduction of its repayment obligation under previous contracts which are attributable to such tracts.

(e) During the first ten years of the repayment period under the amendatory contract, the annual payment obligation of the district shall be reduced by the amounts which the district has credited in the previous year to water users who have provided title for the project drainage program: *Provided*, That the total of such reductions shall not exceed \$50,000.

SEC. 3. (a) Construction and rehabilitation and betterment costs of the Riverton unit which the Secretary determines to be assignable to land classified now or hereafter as permanently unproductive shall be nonreturnable and nonreimbursable: *Provided*, That whenever new lands or lands now or hereafter classified as nonproductive, are classified or reclassified as productive, the repayment obligation of the district shall be increased appropriately.

(b) All miscellaneous net revenues of the Riverton unit shall accrue to the United States and shall be applied against irrigation costs not assigned to be repaid by irrigation water users.

(c) Construction and rehabilitation and betterment costs of the Riverton unit allocated to irrigation and not assigned to be repaid by irrigation water users nor returned from miscellaneous net revenues of the unit shall be returnable from net revenues of the Missouri River Basin project.

SEC. 4. The limitation of lands held in beneficial ownership within the unit by any one owner, which are eligible to receive project water from, through, or by means of project works, shall be one hundred and sixty acres of class 1 land or the equivalent thereof in other classes, as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 5. (a) Lands available for disposition on the Riverton unit, including property acquired pursuant to the Act of March 10, 1964, shall be sold at public or private sale at not less than appraised fair market value at the time of sale. The Secretary may dispose of such lands in tracts of any size, so long as no such disposition will result in a total ownership within the unit by any one owner in excess of the limitation prescribed in section 4 above.

(b) In the disposition of lands on the Riverton unit, resident landowners on the unit who have not obtained relief under the Act of March 10, 1964, as amended, shall have a prior right to purchase tracts in order to supplement their existing farms.

SEC. 6. Appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for carrying on the functions of the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for credits, expenses, charges, and cost provided by or incurred under this Act. The Secretary is authorized to make such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

MR. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ASPINALL was allowed to proceed for an additional 4 minutes.)

MR. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to speak on behalf of H.R. 7521, to explain its relationship to current water resources policy and to aid Members in understanding its importance and its merits. H.R. 7521 is a many-faceted measure. It is a fairly minor bill in terms of the new work authorized to be undertaken, yet it is far reaching in terms of

its potential impact on the future of the community and region which the Riverton reclamation development seeks to serve.

The purpose of this legislation, broadly speaking, is to put the various components of the Riverton project and the Riverton extension unit on a sound operating and fiscal basis. This is accomplished by authorizing the application of many present-day provisions of water resource law to a program where they have not heretofore been available. The bill which we bring to the floor today has been studiously considered in committee, and the Members will note later a number of very significant amendments that are believed vital to the attainment of the basic objectives of the bill.

In presenting this measure to the House, we do not represent it as a typical reclamation authorization, although when the bill passes, the program will be indistinguishable from the typical project. The departures from the typical in this bill are brought about by the necessity to face up to errors in judgment made at least 25 years ago by the Department and by the Congress and which have been left too long unattended. I will now explain to the House what we seek to accomplish in H.R. 7521.

NEW WORK AUTHORIZED

The bill authorizes new Federal expenditures in the amount of \$12,116,000. This authority will enable appropriations for rehabilitation of the canals and laterals of the first and second divisions, and the installation of drainage works that were never completed in the initial construction phases. About \$1 million will be authorized for fish and wildlife habitat development in the project lands and in connection with the water bodies on the project. Everyone should take particular note that we are not authorizing service to any lands to be newly irrigated and we are not sanctioning the expenditure of any funds whatsoever in behalf of third division lands. The work covered by this provision of the bill is typical of that frequently required on projects after they have been in service for 40 or 50 years, and some of the older structures begin to require more maintenance expense than can prudently be made.

AMENDATORY REPAYMENT CONTRACT AUTHORIZED

Under the terms of H.R. 7521, the Secretary of the Interior will be authorized to enter into an amendatory repayment contract with the Midvale Irrigation District. This contract will extend for a term of 50 years, consistently with the present policies of the Congress in such matters. The district will be obliged to pay in accordance with an up-to-date determination of its payment capacity for all of the lands including any lands of the third division which are still arable and which are acquired by Midvale operators and admitted to the district.

This contract will supersede the existing contract under which the Midvale district is obliged to continue payments for more than 100 years. The obligations currently in force under the existing contract will be assumed in part by the new

contract and in part by revenues from the net proceeds of the Missouri River Basin power system. Financial assistance in the amount of some \$19,000,000 is needed and is available for this purpose according to studies and testimony presented to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, this aspect of H.R. 7521 can be likened to the refinancing of a loan not greatly dissimilar from the practices found in private business. Here, we are giving the Riverton people a new contract under the same terms and conditions that we would give a new project. In so doing, we are also asking these borrowers to assume the same obligations that a new borrower would assume. We want them to pay what they are able to pay, and to take care of operation and maintenance. We do not expect them to get any credit for what they paid under their old notes to the Government and have proposed amendments to delete certain proposed credits that would be granted as a consequence of such earlier payments and expenditures. The author of the bill and its primary supporter, the gentleman from Wyoming, our colleague, Mr. WOLB, understand and accept the logic and commonsense of this proposal as do the water users of Midvale.

ACREAGE LIMITATION ADJUSTMENTS

H.R. 7521 will allow the acreage limitation provisions of reclamation law to be administered on the class 1 equivalency concept. What this means is that a landowner may receive water for 160 acres of class 1 irrigable land or its income-producing equivalent in lands of lesser classes. The Congress has long recognized this as an equitable modification of the 160-acre law for projects where limitations of soils, climate, or crop adaptability make it impossible to operate successfully under the strict provisions of the original acreage limitation statute.

FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAMS

The bill provides that justifiable fish and wildlife enhancement works may be undertaken subject to the standard requirement of cost sharing by a non-Federal public body. The State of Wyoming through its duly authorized officials has agreed to operate and maintain the facilities, and to repay with interest one-half the separable costs in accordance with the standard formula set up by Congress in the Federal Water Project Recreation Act, Public Law 89-72.

THIRD DIVISION LANDS

In earlier legislation, the Congress authorized the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the holdings of the unsuccessful settlers on the third division and to make appropriate disposition of these lands. About \$3 million was expended in extinguishing the rights of the settlers. Title to the lands of the third division is now in Federal hands and those lands which are arable are being operated under 1-year lease arrangements by the farmers of the Midvale district. H.R. 7521 would give these farmers a priority to acquire the arable lands of third division and thus restore them to productivity and local tax rolls. The bill also authorizes the Secretary to declare nonreimbursable costs of

development associated with third division land found to be permanently non-productive or nonirrigable.

Mr. Speaker, these are the major features of H.R. 7521. They have the combined effect of restoring the Riverton development to a position of being a credit to the community, the State, and the Nation. We should pass this bill and get the project back on track and forever erase it from our agenda of problems. I urge all Members to assist in passing this measure today.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, the Riverton project and in particular, the third division of the Riverton project, has been the subject of consideration by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Previous attempts to resolve the problem in the third division of this Riverton project serve as an example of bureaucratic ineptitude and lack of innovation.

The Riverton project was originally placed under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation in 1920. The Midvale Irrigation District, the operating entity of the original project, has been successful in operating the first and second divisions, but not without serious hardship and difficulty. In 1944, the third division of the Riverton project was authorized and the project ran into immediate difficulty because of the inability of the lands to accept irrigation water and support crops. In March 1964, the Congress authorized the Secretary of the Interior to repurchase the third division lands and approximately 19,000 acres have been rebought at a price of about \$3 million.

H.R. 7521 proposes to consolidate and integrate the entire Riverton Federal reclamation project, the first, second, and third divisions, into a single entity, by reauthorizing it as the Riverton unit of the Missouri River Basin. H.R. 7521 does this by modifying the plan of the now authorized third division to include the entire Riverton project in the Missouri River Basin project. This permits the entire project to be administered as a unit under the Midvale Irrigation District, which will assume operation and maintenance responsibility for the project works.

The bill authorizes the Secretary to replace all existing repayment contracts with a single amendatory 50-year repayment contract with the Midvale Irrigation District. At the same time, the bill authorizes the construction, rehabilitation, and betterment on canal linings, structures, laterals, drains, and other modifications in the first and second divisions of the project at an estimated cost of \$11,103,000.

In addition, the bill provides that the project will be financially integrated into the Missouri River Basin project, thus providing financial assistance from the net power revenues of the Missouri Basin. H.R. 7521 authorizes a priority of purchase to the present landowners within the project to purchase lands within the third division as supplemental to their existing farms. The bill also exempts the 160-acre limitation of Federal reclamation law to the whole project

with regard to class one land or their equivalent in other land classes as determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

As a result of this consolidation, the total estimated project cost of the Riverton unit as reauthorized is \$43,063,723. Only \$12,116,000 of this amount is new development authorized in this bill; \$11,103,000 of this amount as previously mentioned is for rehabilitation and betterment works and is allocated to irrigation as a project purpose. The remaining \$1,565,900 of the \$12,116,000 authorized for new development involves the costs associated with fish and wildlife enhancement. Of this amount, the State of Wyoming has already expended approximately \$533,000, leaving a \$1,013,000 Federal expenditure and the State will assume the responsibility for operation and maintenance of the fish and wildlife enhancement works.

While I favor the overall approach taken in H.R. 7521, to make the Riverton unit a sound, financially feasible Federal reclamation project, I am dismayed at the committee's inability to permit credits to be given the farmers of the Midvale Irrigation District as was proposed in the legislation when introduced and supported by the Department of the Interior. In essence, the bill as introduced permitted credits in two instances in the sum of \$1,419,119.03 and \$50,000 for payments already made and betterment works already completed to be reflected in the new repayment obligation under the amendatory contract. I regret the committee did not see fit to go one step further in this respect in making this project more financially feasible.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(On request of Mr. Gross, and by unanimous consent, Mr. Saylor was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL), has said this was a project that went sour, or words to that effect, and apparently it went very sour. Now it is proposed to try to salvage something out of it, but is this in the nature of sending good money after bad? Can this project be salvaged?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to tell my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, that the first two units of the Riverton project, while they had difficulty in operating, were able to make their payments. The third unit of the Riverton project, which was authorized during World War II, was a fiasco from the day it was authorized. There was no proper survey of the land, and many young men returning from the service were led to believe that if they would go out to that area, they would get a 160-acre farm.

It was so bad that after hearings before our committee both in the field and here in Washington, D.C., we authorized the Bureau of Reclamation to go out and buy out all of the farmers who wanted to sell in the third unit of the Riverton project.

What we are doing in this bill by changing the 160-acre limitation law is allowing the farmers who are presently on units one and two the right to buy additional land in what was described as unit number three, and add it to their present farms or ranches, so that they can have a better project.

When the Bureau of Reclamation sent its report in, it asked that the sum of a little more than \$1 million which had been paid by the irrigators in the third district be given as a credit against the new contract. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs decided that this was not correct, that they should not give the local farmers this benefit.

I understand from the people in the area, even though they would have liked to have credit for that \$1 million plus, they are willing to accept this project now.

Mr. GROSS. Then this project does not add new lands for irrigation purposes, but rather is an attempt to rehabilitate, in part at least, that which has failed?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. There is a figure on page 6 of the bill of \$12,116,000, and following that, in parenthesis, it says "based on July 1969 prices."

Are we here today adopting an authorization figure of \$12,116,000 knowing that there has been an increase in cost over the past year and that this figure will be increased?

Mr. SAYLOR. I might say to my colleague from Iowa that at the time we held these hearings early this year the latest figures we had available were the July prices. We cannot get a completely up-to-date figure. At the time the hearings were held and the witnesses appeared to testify this was the latest figure available to the committee.

Mr. GROSS. That was July a year ago?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Not last July, but July a year ago.

I have one further question with respect to the language on page 5, which states in part: "on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for 15 years from date of issue."

Is this normal language in a bill of this nature, and if so, is the interest rate on 15-year obligations more favorable to the borrower? What is the story?

Mr. SAYLOR. I might say to my colleague from Iowa, this is the formula which has been updated, to be used now. While it does not reflect the actual cost of present-day borrowing, it is the figure that has been used in all reclamation projects and all Public Works projects to determine the feasibility.

I want to say it is only because the

Public Works Committees of the House and Senate have come into agreement that we have this updated and now have this figure. Up until about 18 months ago we had a figure considerably less than that.

Mr. GROSS. Considering the billions upon billions of dollars this Government is in debt, there are few, comparatively speaking, long-term or 15-year obligations. Most of it is very short term—5 years or less.

Mr. SAYLOR. A lot of the money at the present time which the Government is borrowing is on short-term notes. But we still do have outstanding some long-term loans.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAYLOR

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

The Clerk read the amendment as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: Page 2, line 2, strike out "project," and insert "project: *Provided*, That all identifiable return flows of water from the general plan as modified and reauthorized shall be treated for the purpose of abating pollution and improving water quality, in such manner as determined by the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as I said before, this is the amendment that I would like to see adopted in this legislation. However, I am a realist and I realize it is impossible to get this amendment adopted at this time.

The purpose of this amendment is to carry out the congressional intent to abate water pollution and improve our environment. This Nation is on the threshold of a major attack on water pollution. The Council on Environmental Quality in its recent report recommended that a strong and consistent Federal policy should be developed to control water pollution and insure effective enforcement of water quality standards.

The place to begin is here in our consideration of legislation authorizing Federal water resource developments—be they large or small. And, the time to begin is now. This is essentially what the amendment I have offered does, by writing into basic law the requirement that all identifiable flows of water from works and facilities authorized in this Federal project shall be inspected and treated for the purpose of abating water pollution and improving water quality.

This is not a complex amendment. The amendment merely requires: First, that the flows of water be identified from the works and facilities authorized in the act, if they cannot be identified then there is nothing to be done; and, second, if the flows of water can be identified, the amendment requires that the water flow be inspected for water pollution. If water pollution is found then the amendment requires that the water flows be treated to abate the pollution and improve the water quality. All this is to be done in such manner as is determined by the Secretary of the Interior. If the Secretary of the Interior does not have the money or manpower within his De-

partment or the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, then the Secretary, I am certain, will be more than willing to request more money and manpower from the Congress.

I am aware that there are those who will rise in opposition to this amendment and propose arguments against its adoption on the basis that this amendment has no place in this little project. I would point out to my colleagues that this Congress passed Public Law 91-190, commonly known as the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. The amendment which I have offered is merely a step, a small step, in carrying out the congressional declaration of a national environmental policy. I would also say to my colleagues to beware of those who clamor for the improvement of our environment, so long as it is not required in their own backyard.

Improvement of our environment, abating water pollution, and improving water quality are all part of the same problem. If we in the Congress are to carry out our commitment to improve the environment then we must begin by requiring that Federal water resources developments, of large, small, or medium size, be continually monitored for the purpose of abating water pollution and improving water quality.

If we are to have a national policy on the environment, then the Federal Government should set the example. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAYLOR

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: On page 2 at the end of line 2, "The Riverton extension unit shall be operated in such manner that identifiable return flows of water will not cause the Wind River to be in violation of water quality standards promulgated pursuant to the Water Quality Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 903)."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, at the time we had the Narrows project in Colorado before the House and went to conference this language was adopted as being a step forward in requiring the Secretary of the Interior to operate the reclamation projects in accordance with water quality standards. Therefore, this is the same amendment that has been agreed to in conference.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the amendment just read by the gentleman from Pennsylvania meets with the approval of the people on this side. We have no objection to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

The amendment was agreed to.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: Page 1, line 7, after "conservation," insert "fish and wildlife conservation and development."

Page 2, line 13, strike out "confirmed," and insert "executed."

Page 2, line 23 through page 3, line 12, strike out all of subsections (d) and (e).

Page 3, line 15, strike out "land" and insert "lands".

Page 4, line 4, strike out "project," and insert "project within fifty years from and including the year in which the amendatory contract authorized by this Act is executed."

Page 4, line 9, after "other" insert "land".

Page 4, following line 23, insert a new Section 6 as follows:

"Sec. 6. (a) The provision of lands, facilities, and project modifications which furnish fish and wildlife benefits in connection with the Riverton extension unit shall be in accordance with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act (79 Stat. 213).

"(b) The interest rate used for purposes of computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance of the capital cost allocated to interest-bearing features of the project shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction of said interest-bearing features is initiated, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue."

Page 4, line 24, renumber "Sec. 6." to read "Sec. 7."

Page 5, following line 4, insert a new Section 8 reading as follows:

"Sec. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for rehabilitation and betterment of the facilities of the first and second divisions of the Riverton unit, for completion of drainage works for said first and second divisions, and for fish and wildlife measures as authorized by this Act, the sum of \$12,116,000 (based on July 1969 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved herein. There are also authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be required for operation and maintenance of the Riverton unit."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, I, first of all, would like to express my great appreciation for the outstanding leadership of Chairman ASPINALL and to my colleagues on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for reporting out my bill, H.R. 7521, to reauthorize the entire Riverton project as a single unit of the Missouri River Basin project. The Riverton reclamation project is located in central Wyoming in Fremont County.

The legislation before us today is in essence a reauthorization for the future of agriculture in much of central Wyoming. We hear a lot these days about urban decay and urban renewal. The urban problems are real and few would argue that the billions of dollars being

spent to remedy these problems are unjustified. But we must not allow all this attention on urban problems to blind us to the fact that we also have rural renewal needs. Many of these symptoms are present in the situation which my legislation remedies.

Favorable consideration of H.R. 7521 is a matter of vital importance to the economic welfare of Wyoming. It has been the subject of exhaustive congressional study and deliberation for the past several years.

The bill under consideration would authorize the consolidation of 45,000 acres of the first and second divisions, designated the Midvale Irrigation District, and the 25,000 acre third division, designated the Riverton Extension Unit Missouri River Basin. By consolidating these projects into a single organization, the existing Midvale Irrigation District would assume responsibility for planning, operation, contracting, and maintaining the combined units.

The bill further provides that the combined units would be financially integrated into the overall Missouri River Basin project, with a 50-year repayment contract. The bill provides for the resale of Government-owned, arable third division lands to Midvale farmers. Authorization is also included for necessary drainage construction, needed rehabilitation of distribution systems and equipment, and financial assistance from the net power revenues of the Missouri River Basin project. The bill also authorizes a small fish and wildlife enhancement program consisting of lands and habitat improvement for game and migratory waterfowl.

By way of background, money for the original Riverton project was made available from the Indian Appropriations Act of 1918. The Bureau of Reclamation assumed control of the project in 1920 and 5 years later the first water was delivered for irrigation. Construction of the irrigation facilities serving the first two divisions was essentially completed prior to World War II. The third division, designated the Riverton Extension Unit, was authorized in 1944 and construction was initiated on a crash basis in 1946 to provide settlement opportunities for World War II veterans. Settlement commenced in 1949.

The project was plagued with financial difficulties from the outset.

Conditions caused a breakdown in the long-term repayment contract and in 1962 the contract was terminated. In 1964, Congress authorized the Secretary of Interior to purchase third division land. Virtually all of the third division was purchased by the United States.

The farmers of the first and second divisions now lease virtually all irrigable and productive third division land and have shown that in the hands of competent and experienced farmers it is as productive for crops and pasture as their own land in the first and second divisions of the Midvale Irrigation District.

The Midvale Irrigation District is directed by farmers who have shown over many hard and often lean years how to make a living in an environment of complex soil and erratic weather conditions.

The strength of these men is further reflected in their efficient and responsible irrigation organization, which among other things has never missed a repayment to the Government.

The Midvale Irrigation District has already demonstrated the capacity to assume central administration of the three districts. For several years, Midvale has been providing water to third division leaseholders. It is a matter of record that the cost of delivering water to the three divisions can be handled as economically as the unit cost presently in existence.

The legislation before us today is a reauthorization for the future of our rural communities.

Failure to reauthorize the Riverton project as I have proposed would seriously impair the economic and social growth of the region. Without rehabilitation of the first and second divisions, the Bureau of Reclamation estimates that about 24 percent of the land would be lost to cultivation because of continuing seepage, salinity, and structure failures. Loss of that much productive land in an agricultural based economy would be catastrophic.

Failure to act now would mean the continued degradation of third division lands, representing a Federal investment of more than \$18 million.

Further delay will only feed the doubts of the enterprising agricultural people and the young farmpeople who want to stay on the farm but are discouraged by the unsettled economic conditions and limited opportunities for growth.

The problems facing Midvale are no less fundamental than the crisis confronting many of our cities. If one accepts this view, then the question is: Do we step up to the rural problems with the same imagination and support now working to iron out the urban problems? I would certainly hope so. Favorable action on my bill will be a step in that direction.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7521, to reauthorize the Riverton extension unit, Missouri River Basin project, to include the entire Riverton Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes, is the result of a decade of cooperative study and consideration by the Department of the Interior and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. As recommended to be amended by the committee, this measure will provide the basis for settlement of the outstanding problems which have confronted the Riverton community since shortly after World War II.

When H.R. 7521 is enacted and implemented, the Riverton extension unit as it will then be constituted will be a soundly based, operating water resource development that is a credit to those who have worked on it through the years.

In order for Members to understand the bill, it is important to review, very briefly, the history of Riverton; the evolution of its difficulties; and the interim steps that have heretofore been taken.

The original Riverton project, sometimes known as the first and second divisions, was started almost 50 years ago

as an Indian irrigation project. Almost immediately, jurisdiction was transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation which delivered the first irrigation water in 1925. Construction of the first two divisions was substantially finished by 1940.

The third division was authorized as the Riverton extension unit in the omnibus bill of 1944 and was started under construction as soon as World War II was ended. Settlement of veterans on the farms of the third division was undertaken in 1949.

Difficulties soon arose on the third division. The lands were not well suited to irrigation, and particularly under the quality of management that was received from the inexperienced settlers. As a result, much of the land of the third division was ruined, the settlers were in financial distress, and the whole situation was almost beyond control. In the meantime, the first and second divisions were functioning reasonably well under a repayment contract between the United States and the Midvale Irrigation District.

Things finally got so bad that Congress, in 1964, passed an act under which the Secretary of the Interior was authorized to buy out the third division landowners and to make appropriate disposition of the lands. About \$3,200,000 was expended in implementing this legislation. At the time the 1964 measure was under consideration, it was understood that the problems of the Midvale Irrigation District would be the subject of future legislation. H.R. 7521 is responsive to that understanding.

Simply stated, H.R. 7521 will modernize the Riverton project; it will authorize necessary rehabilitation of distribution works and provide drainage facilities long neglected; it will make realistic adjustments in reimbursable costs by writing off costs associated with permanently nonproductive lands and providing financial assistance for those costs which are beyond the water users' payment ability; it will adopt modern concepts of cost sharing for fish and wildlife; and it will adjust acreage limitations to a realistic basis. All of these provisions are consistent and compatible with current principles of reclamation financing. They are nothing more nor less than would be afforded to new projects now being considered for authorization and development.

As I pointed out earlier, our committee has looked at the Riverton from every standpoint. We have no record of anything but the most limited opposition. The Wind River Indians who have signed away their rights to the lands of the division have registered a mild protest, not with the bill but with certain land management and leasing practices, and one private citizen who desires to continue interim use of some public lands constitute the only opposition to this measure in the community, the State, or the Congress. The Interior Department also endorses the bill and the Bureau of the Budget endorses it in part.

Now, let us look and see what kind of project we will have when this bill becomes law.

Economic justification of the Riverton extension unit is demonstrated by a benefit-cost ratio of 1.78 to 1—total benefits—and a ratio of 1.26 to 1—direct benefits only. These computations take into account all costs of the program whensoever incurred and the benefits that will occur with the development proposed by H.R. 7521. The incremental benefit-cost ratios associated with the developmental work and rehabilitation specifically authorized by H.R. 7521 are 2.07 to 1 and 1.41 to 1 for total and direct benefits, respectively.

The total estimated project cost of the Riverton extension unit, as reauthorized by H.R. 7521, including previous expenses and future development, is \$43,063,728. This amount is tentatively allocable to water resource development purposes as follows:

Irrigation	\$40,984,659
Power	513,169
Fish and wildlife.....	1,565,900
Total	43,063,728

The costs allocated to power are repayable with interest from revenues creditable to the power produced at the existing Pilot Butte powerplant. Surplus revenues from the sale of project power in the amount of \$453,169 will be available to assist in the repayment of irrigation costs beyond the ability of the water users to repay.

Fish and wildlife costs will be returned in accordance with the policy requirements of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act, under which the State of Wyoming will assume total responsibility for operation, maintenance, and replacement of fish and wildlife enhancement works, and repay within a term of 50 years, with interest, one-half the project cost allocated to fish and wildlife purpose—\$783,000. The costs allocated to fish and wildlife over and above those borne by the State of Wyoming will be nonreimbursable.

Costs allocated to irrigation will be repaid by water user revenues, by financial assistance from net power revenues of the Riverton extension unit and the Missouri River Basin project, by minor miscellaneous receipts, or will be nonreimbursable in accordance with previous legislation and the terms of H.R. 7521.

The studies available to our committee establish the availability of the required power revenues. On this basis, we have brought out this bill and believe that it merits approval by the House.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1185 the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 434) to reauthorize the Riverton extension unit, Missouri River Basin project, to include therein the entire Riverton Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of California moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 434 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 7521 as passed, as follows:

That the general plan for the Riverton extension unit, Missouri River Basin project heretofore authorized under section 9 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887), is modified to include relief to water users, construction, betterment of works, land rehabilitation, water conservation, fish and wildlife conservation and development, flood control, and silt control on the entire Riverton Federal reclamation project. As so modified the general plan is reauthorized under the designation "Riverton unit of the Missouri River Basin project". The Riverton extension unit shall be operated in such manner that identifiable return flows of water will not cause the Wind River to be in violation of water quality standards promulgated pursuant to the Water Quality Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 903).

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to negotiate and execute an amendatory repayment contract with the Midvale Irrigation District covering all lands of the Riverton unit. This contract shall replace all existing repayment contracts between the Midvale Irrigation District and the United States.

(b) The period for repayment of the construction and rehabilitation and betterment costs allocated to irrigation and assigned to be repaid by the irrigation water users shall be fifty years from and including the year in which such amendatory repayment contract is executed.

(c) During the period required to construct and test the adequacy of drains and other water conservation works, the rates of charge to land classes and the acreage assessable in each land class in the unit shall continue to be as established in the amendatory repayment contract with the district dated June 26, 1952; thereafter such rates of charge and assessable acreage shall be in accordance with the amortization capacity and classification of unit lands as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. (a) Construction and rehabilitation and betterment costs of the Riverton unit which the Secretary determines to be assignable to lands classified now or hereafter as permanently unproductive shall be nonreturnable and nonreimbursable: *Provided*, That whenever new lands or lands now or hereafter classified as nonproductive, are reclassified as productive, the repayment obligation of the district shall be increased appropriately.

(b) All miscellaneous net revenues of the Riverton unit shall accrue to the United States and shall be applied against irrigation costs not assigned to be repaid by irrigation water users.

(c) Construction and rehabilitation and betterment costs of the Riverton unit allocated to irrigation and not assigned to be repaid by irrigation water users nor returned from miscellaneous net revenues of the unit shall be returnable from net revenues of the Missouri River Basin project within fifty years from and including the year in which the amendatory contract authorized by this Act is executed.

SEC. 4. The limitation of lands held in beneficial ownership within the unit by any one owner, which are eligible to receive project water from, through, or by means of project works, shall be one hundred and sixty acres of class 1 land or the equivalent thereof in other land classes, as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 5. (a) Lands available for disposition on the Riverton unit, including property acquired pursuant to the Act of March 10, 1964, shall be sold at public or private sale at not less than appraised fair market value at the time of sale. The Secretary may dispose of such lands in tracts of any size, so long as no such disposition will result in a total ownership within the unit by any one owner in excess of the limitation prescribed in section 4 above.

(b) In the disposition of lands on the Riverton unit, resident landowners on the unit who have not obtained relief under the Act of March 10, 1964, as amended, shall have a prior right to purchase tracts in order to supplement their existing farms.

SEC. 6. (a) The provision of lands, facilities, and project modifications which furnish fish and wildlife benefits in connection with the Riverton extension unit shall be in accordance with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act (79 Stat. 213).

(b) The interest rate used for purposes of computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance of the capital cost allocated to interest-bearing features of the project shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction of said interest-bearing features is initiated, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue.

SEC. 7. Appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for carrying on the functions of the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for credits, expenses, charges, and cost provided by or incurred under this Act. The Secretary is authorized to make such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for rehabilitation and betterment of the facilities of the first and second divisions of the Riverton unit, for completion of drainage works for said first and second divisions, and for fish and wildlife measures as authorized by this Act, the sum of \$12,116,000 (based on July 1969 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved herein. There are also authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be required for operation and maintenance of the Riverton unit.

The motion was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 7521) was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GULF ISLANDS NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 10874) to provide for the establishment of the Gulf Islands National Seashore, in the States of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi, for the recognition of certain historic values at Fort San Carlos, Fort Redoubt, Fort Barrancas, and Fort Pickens in Florida and Fort Massachusetts in Mississippi, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to preserve for public use and enjoyment certain areas possessing outstanding natural, historic, and recreational values, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") may establish and administer the Gulf Islands National Seashore (hereinafter referred to as the "seashore"). The seashore shall comprise the following gulf coast islands and mainland areas, together with adjacent water areas as generally depicted on the drawing entitled "Proposed Boundary Plan, Proposed Gulf Islands National Seashore," numbered NS GI 7100F, and dated May 1969:

- (1) The Chandeleur Islands in Louisiana;
- (2) Cat, Ship, Petit Bois, and Horn Islands in Mississippi;
- (3) One Island in Alabama;
- (4) Perdido Key in Alabama and Florida;
- (5) Santa Rosa Island in Florida, exclusive of the Fort Walton, Navarre, and Pensacola beaches;
- (6) The Naval Live Oaks Reservation in Florida;
- (7) Fort Pickens and the Fort Pickens State Park in Florida; and
- (8) A tract of land in the Pensacola Naval Air Station in Florida that includes the Coast Guard Station and Lighthouse, Fort San Carlos, Fort Barrancas, and Fort Redoubt, and Fort McRee on Perdido Key, and sufficient surrounding land for proper administration and protection of the historic resources.

SEC. 2. (a) Within the boundaries of the seashore, the Secretary may acquire lands, waters, and interests therein by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange, except that property owned by a State or any political subdivision thereof may be acquired only with the consent of the owner. The Secretary may acquire by any of the above methods not more than one hundred acres of land or interests therein outside of the seashore boundaries on the mainland in the vicinity of Biloxi-Gulfport, Mississippi, for an administrative site and related facilities for access to the seashore; and not more than ten acres of land on or near Seville Square in Pensacola, for administrative or historical purposes. With the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, any Federal property within the seashore and mainland site may be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for the purposes of the seashore.

(b) When acquiring lands, waters, and interests therein within the boundaries of the seashore, the Secretary shall permit a reservation by the grantor of all or any part of the oil, gas, and other minerals in such lands or waters and of other minerals therein which can be removed without undue interference with the administration, development, or public use of the seashore, with the right of occupation and use of so much of the surface of the lands or waters as may be required for all purposes reasonably incident to the mining or removal of oil, gas, and other minerals which can be removed by similar means from beneath the surface of such lands and waters and the lands and waters adjacent thereto, under such regulations as the Secretary deems appropriate.

(c) With respect to improved residential property acquired for the purposes of this Act which is beneficially owned by a natural person and which the Secretary of the Interior determines can be continued in that use for a limited period of time without undue interference with the administration,

development, or public use of the seashore, the owner thereof may on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary retain a right of use and occupancy of the property for noncommercial residential purposes for a term, as the owner may elect, ending either (1) at the death of the owner or his spouse, whichever occurs later, or (2) not more than twenty-five years from the date of acquisition. Any right so retained may during its existence be transferred or assigned. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the fair market value of the property on the date of such acquisition, less their fair market value on such date of the right retained by the owner.

(d) As used in this Act, "improved residential property" means a single-family year-round dwelling, the construction of which began before January 1, 1967, and which serves as the owner's permanent place of abode at the time of its acquisition by the United States, together with not more than three acres of land on which the dwelling and appurtenant buildings are located that the Secretary finds is reasonably necessary for the owner's continued use and occupancy of the dwelling: *Provided*, That the Secretary may exclude from improved residential property any marsh, beach, or waters and adjoining land that the Secretary deems is necessary for public access to such marsh, beach, or waters.

(e) The Secretary may terminate a right of use and occupancy retained pursuant to this section upon his determination that such use and occupancy is being exercised in a manner not consistent with the purposes of this Act, and upon tender to the holder of the right an amount equal to the fair market value of that portion of the right which remains unexpired on the date of termination.

Sec. 3. The Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters within the seashore in accordance with applicable Federal and State laws: *Provided*, That he may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting or fishing will be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, fish or wildlife management, or public use and enjoyment. Except in emergencies, any regulations issued by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall be put into effect only after consultation with the appropriate State agencies responsible for hunting and fishing activities.

Sec. 4. With the exception of areas within Horn and Petit Bois Islands, the Secretary may, in accordance with such regulations as he deems appropriate, permit the removal of leaseable minerals from lands or interests in lands under his jurisdiction within the seashore in accordance with the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), as amended (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), or the Acquired Lands Mineral Leasing Act of August 7, 1947 (30 U.S.C. 351 et seq.), if he finds that such removal would not have significant adverse effects on the administration, development, or public use of the seashore.

Sec. 5. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the Secretary shall administer the seashore in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916 (30 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.). In the administration of the seashore the Secretary may utilize such statutory authorities available to him for the conservation and management of wildlife and natural resources as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act. With respect to Fort Redoubt, Fort San Carlos, Fort Barrancas at Pensacola Naval Air Station, Fort Pickens on Santa Rosa Island, and Fort McRee on Perdido Key, Florida, and Fort Massachusetts on Ship Island, Mississippi, together with such adjacent lands as the Secretary may designate, the Secretary shall administer such

lands so as to recognize, preserve, and interpret their national historical significance in accordance with the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461-467), and he may designate them as national historic sites. The Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1220), which provided for the establishment of the Pensacola National Monument, is hereby repealed.

Sec. 6. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army may cooperate in the study and formulation of plans for beach erosion control and hurricane protection of the seashore. Any such protective works or spoil deposit activities undertaken by the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, shall be carried out within the seashore in accordance with a plan that is acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior and that is consistent with the purposes of this Act.

Sec. 7. There are hereby transferred from the National Wildlife Refuge System to the seashore the Horn Island and Petit Bois National Wildlife Refuges to be administered in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 8. No provision of this Act, or of any other Act made applicable thereby, shall be construed to affect, supersede, or modify any authority of the Department of the Army or the Chief of Engineers, with respect to navigation or related matters except as specifically provided in section 6 of this Act.

Sec. 9. There is hereby established a Gulf Islands National Seashore Advisory Commission. The Commission shall terminate ten years after the date the lakeshore is established pursuant to this Act. The Commission shall be composed of three members from each county in which the seashore is located, each appointed for a term of two years by the Secretary as follows:

- (1) one member to be appointed from recommendations made by the county commissioners in the respective counties;
- (2) one member to be appointed from recommendations made by the Governor of the State from each county; and
- (3) one member to be designated by the Secretary from each county.

Provided, That two members shall be appointed to the Advisory Commission in each instance in counties whose population exceeds one hundred thousand.

The Secretary shall designate one member to be Chairman. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation as such. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expenses reasonably incurred by the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act on vouchers signed by the Chairman.

The Secretary or his designee shall, from time to time, consult with the Commission with respect to the matters relating to the development of the Gulf Islands National Seashore.

Sec. 10. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ASPINALL was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10874, as recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, carries out the basic thrust of the bill as it was originally introduced by our friends from the gulf coast States—Messrs. COLMER, SIKES, HÉBERT, and DICKINSON. If enacted, it will authorize the establishment of the Gulf Islands National Seashore.

FACTS ABOUT THE SEASHORE PROPOSAL

After considering the legislation in considerable detail, the committee concluded that most of the revisions recommended by the Department of the Interior should be approved. Consequently, the bill provides for a national seashore comprised of lands located only in the States of Mississippi and Florida. The Chandeleur Islands of Louisiana were removed from the seashore boundaries because they are already protected as a part of the national wildlife refuge system and because they are relatively isolated and unsuitable for mass recreation use. Ono Island and part of Perdido Key in Alabama were also removed from the seashore because they are already intensively developed and would require an undesirable increased outlay.

If approved, House Resolution 10874 will add to the Nation's inventory of outdoor areas a valuable recreation asset. Like Cape Cod, Assateague Island, and Point Reyes, the proposed Gulf Island National Seashore is located within easy driving distance of millions of Americans. It is anticipated that it will serve the recreation needs of people living within a seven-State region and that it will draw vacationers from the other parts of the country. Of the 23 million residents located in the vicinity, 10 million live within 250 miles of the proposed seashore and will be able to enjoy it relatively frequently. Because of the population concentration in the area, annual visitations are expected to reach 3.5 million within 5 years and may total 10 million within the foreseeable future.

Persons familiar with the areas involved in the Gulf Islands National Seashore might reasonably ask: Why do we expect such a heavy influx of visitors at this seashore? The answer to this question involves more than a simple reflection of the large populous residing nearby, it involves the nature of the area. The Gulf Islands Seashore proposal offers an outstanding combination of features to the visiting public—a combination that would be difficult to match in any other part of the country.

For the sportsmen, there are numerous opportunities. The beautiful sandy beaches of the area and the gulf waters offer a variety of water-oriented activities. Swimming, water skiing, fishing, boating, and beachcombing will all be popular activities. In addition, the location of the seashore at the bottom of the Mississippi flyway makes it an excellent area for migratory waterfowl hunters.

Recreation at the seashore, however, will not be limited to the usual outdoor pursuits, because the seashore has other significant values that will appeal to many visitors. People interested in the history and culture of our country will find the old forts located within the seashore interesting places to visit. Others interested in nature study, photography, and primitive camping will find other parts of the seashore a nice place for their retreat.

NEED

About a decade ago, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission reported that the Nation's principal out-

door resources were remotely located and relatively inaccessible to the Nation's major population centers and it recommended that all levels of government—Federal, State, and local—make a concentrated effort to expand the opportunities for outdoor recreation near them.

During the 1960's, the Congress moved to meet that need. Long before "environment" and "ecology" were common terms in our vocabulary, efforts were underway to provide a better place for people to live. Cape Cod National Seashore, Point Reyes, and Padre Island were the start of something new—they were the beginning of the national effort to provide large natural areas for the outdoor recreation needs of the people living in the densely populated regions of the east coast, gulf coast, and west coast. They were followed by many other areas like Assateague Island National Seashore, Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity Recreation area complex. Like all of those areas, Gulf Islands National Seashore aims at helping to meet a part of the national need for more readily accessible outdoor recreation areas.

Altogether, the seashore will comprise 18,100 acres of land—about 7,750 acres in Mississippi and approximately 10,350 acres in Florida. If approved as recommended by the committee, it will include three islands in Mississippi and a significant portion of Santa Rosa Island and Perdido Key in Florida as well as some very interesting old forts, an old lighthouse, and the old Naval Live Oaks Reserve on the mainland.

Much of this land is already in Federal or State ownership so that land acquisition costs should be relatively nominal. It is estimated that the privately owned lands or interests in lands needed for the seashore can be acquired for \$3,120,000. State-owned lands and other publicly owned lands would be acquired by donation or transfer without cost. All land acquisition moneys, of course, would be appropriated from funds available in the Land and Water Conservation Fund for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10874, as amended by the committee, is a sound bill. It will authorize an outstanding new addition to the National Park System and it will help to serve a national goal. I am pleased to recommend it to my colleagues and I urge its approval.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I am very glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I notice in the report that there has apparently been some difficulty over Federal lands known as the Naval Live Oaks Reservation. This land was turned over to the State of Florida and has not been used properly, according to the terms of the Government stipulation as to use. What about this? Can someone explain it, at least briefly?

Mr. ASPINALL. I gladly yield to my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) in whose district this area is situated.

Mr. SIKES. This land was made available to the State of Florida years ago at low cost for public park purposes. A suit

was brought within the State by private claimants who insisted that they held title to the property by having acquired tax deeds many years before, although the Federal Government had not at that time relinquished its ownership. The State supreme court ruled that the property should, in fact, belong to the private claimants, since it had been acquired by the State. However, the restriction on the use of the property continued. It could only be used for public park purposes. The Federal Government says it has not been used for those purposes.

Simply stated the Federal Government retained a reverter clause under which the land could be reclaimed if it was not used for public park purposes. The Federal Government is now in the process of recapturing the property by the exercise of its reverter clause.

Mr. GROSS. So the land will be recovered by the Federal Government and made a part of this seashore project?

Mr. SIKES. Yes, and it will be made a part of the seashore project.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very interesting area consisting of some 1,300 plus acres. It was one of the original sites established shortly after 1800 by the Federal Government as a source of live oak timber for naval vessels. As a matter of historical interest, some of the old trees are there now and the area has archeological values that are quite important.

It also borders on the Santa Rosa Sound and it is a very attractive area.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL) has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado may have 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask a question concerning what happens in this hurricane prone area in which the seashore project is being established. What happens in the case of a hurricane where there may be serious destruction of property? Does the Government rebuild it?

Mr. ASPINALL. If my colleague will permit me, let me say this: In the area on the continent itself we do not have any difficulty there, but these islands are constantly moving, as my colleague very well knows. They move to a limited extent, more than likely, toward the west. On the other hand, there will not be any development work in this particular area of any consequence, of any value, and any hurricane that would come in would simply move the sand area without disturbance to any valuable improvements.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman speaks of boat dockings, marinas.

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes, there will be some boat dockings, some trails, and some camp ground development.

Mr. GROSS. It is not planned to put up any structures of any size?

Mr. ASPINALL. Important structures will not be based there, and the administration headquarters will be on the mainland.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, H.R. 10874, to provide for the establishment of the Gulf Islands National Seashore in the States of Florida and Mississippi.

Establishment of the Gulf Islands National Seashore will represent a significant addition to our growing national seashore system. The Gulf Islands National Seashore will comprise approximately 18,080 acres of land, exclusive of submerged lands in the States of Florida and Mississippi. More than half of this total acreage is presently in public ownership.

The physical resources and wildlife of these gulf barrier islands provide an excellent variety of outdoor recreation. Perhaps the most outstanding resource of these islands are the wide, gently sloping white sandy beaches matched against the clear blue waters of the Gulf of Mexico. The land and waters of these islands will provide unlimited opportunities for camping, picnicking, fishing, swimming, skindiving, water skiing, boating, and hiking.

The seashore will present a prime recreational opportunity to some 23 million people in the seven State region of Florida, Louisiana, Arkansas, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia. Approximately 10 million people live within 250 miles or a reasonable driving distance of the proposed seashore. It is estimated that visitation to the seashore is expected to exceed 3½ million within 5 years after establishment of the seashore, and increasing to 10 million annual visits.

This bill also provides for the recognition of certain military fortifications and other values which are part of the historical panorama of this great Nation. The seashore then will not only provide much needed public recreational opportunities, but also, preserve certain of the historical values of importance in the early development of this Nation.

Establishment of the Gulf Islands National Seashore is estimated to cost \$3,120,000 for the acquisition of lands and interests in lands. The costs for development of the seashore are estimated to be \$14,799,000.

The passage and enactment of this legislation will be an important step in preserving for the benefit and enjoyment of future generations the recreational, natural, scenic, and historical values in this area. At the same time, the bill provides for the review of the unique flora and fauna in the proposed seashore for inclusion as wilderness under the Wilderness Act. The seashore will be a significant contribution in our effort to preserve for public use and enjoyment the diminishing seashore and adjacent islands of our Nation which are increasingly subject to private development.

Mr. Speaker, I support the passage of this legislation establishing the Gulf Islands National Seashore.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I am most appreciative to the distinguished chairman and the members of this outstanding committee for bringing this bill to the floor.

H.R. 10874, of which I am privileged to be a cosponsor, is a bill which I endorse wholeheartedly. My district, and in fact the entire gulf coast, is significantly affected by the bill and I consider it one of the most important measures that I have introduced in all of my time in Congress. I want to speak primarily to the Florida portion of the bill. My distinguished colleague, Mr. COLMER will discuss the Mississippi portion. In my opinion, the passage of this bill is essential for the preservation of historic sites of great national interest, essential for the protection of wooded and beach areas in their natural state, and essential for the development of recreational sites of a type not available anywhere else in the Nation. Each of these values combine to provide an unusually attractive area and each will have constantly increasing value to posterity. Without this bill, we stand to lose magnificent beach and woodland areas to commercial development, and to lose important historic forts through decay and neglect. It is important to consider that neither the State nor the Federal Government over the years has provided the funds to keep the historic forts in a satisfactory state of preservation. They simply are not in the old fort business. As a consequence, these forts are deteriorating year by year and substantial parts of them now are closed to the public. This is a very sad commentary on what is happening to important historic sites.

Let me also call attention to the fact that nearly all of the land to be made available in the Florida portion of the seashore, although very valuable, is through donation. The historic forts, some of which date back to Spanish colonial days, and the old lighthouse, which has been in service more than 100 years, are now a part of the Pensacola Naval Air Station. The Fort Pickens State Park, which comprises Fort Pickens plus 7½ miles of island, fronted on the one side by the gulf and on the other by Santa Rosa Sound, is State property and it is to be transferred without cost to the Department of the Interior for inclusion in the seashore. An additional 7½ miles of Santa Rosa Island, also fronted on one side by the gulf and the other by the sound, will be made available by donation from Escambia County, Fla., which is the present owner of the property. The value of this property is hard to estimate, but it will run into many millions of dollars—\$25 million would be a reasonable estimate—and it comes to the U.S. Government free of charge.

There are other areas which also are to be included in the Florida portion of the project. One is the Naval Live Oaks Reservation, more than 1,300 acres of land which borders on Santa Rosa Sound and on Pensacola Bay. This property is one of the first areas set aside by the Federal Government as a natural preserve. This was done in the early 1800's in order to have a source of strong timbers for naval vessels. The property

still has many exciting old live oak trees, and in addition it has important archeological assets. The remaining portion which is to be made immediately available to the project is the eastern half of Perdido Key. Most of this property already belongs to the Federal Government, but some is privately owned and must be acquired by purchase.

It is of more than casual interest that this national historic and recreation area which will have great value to the people and great importance to the Nation can be established immediately with no cost for acquisition of most of the Florida land, which is to be included, and only minimal costs for initiating the program. The public can begin to reap the benefits from this exciting area without the time-consuming delays ordinarily accompanying the establishment of such public parks. The property is readily accessible by highways and bridges and usable on a year-round basis, not just in summer. The seashore will be interesting to all segments of the public—historians, swimmers, boaters, fishermen, hikers, tourists, and just plain beachgoers. It is strongly supported by local residents and by the State government and the county governments which are affected.

The committee well knows the tremendous demands which are now being made by a travel-conscious and recreation-minded public for facilities of this nature. There are no similar facilities operated by the Federal Government anywhere within hundreds of miles and none to my knowledge with such a wide range of interest to so many people. Here is an area in which 20 million people live within a day's drive. Many already are seeking out the pleasures of Florida's gulf coast. People come here from throughout the Nation, and more will come as word of the year-round desirability of this beautiful countryside becomes known.

I believe this will be an excellent development for the American taxpayer and one which will increase significantly in value to all of the people with each passing year. Fortunately it comes at bargain prices and this also will be of significance to the taxpayer.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, is the Federal Government going to be called upon to liquidate the long-term leases on the land?

Mr. SIKES. Oh, no. The property that is under lease is not being acquired as part of the seashore. Leased and developed property are entirely separate and will continue under present jurisdiction. The Federal Government is not planning to acquire the leases. That would run into much more money than we are discussing now.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10874 is the culmination of the efforts of many individuals who spent many hours working out its details. During the 90th Congress, several members of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation visited the area involved and conducted field hearings in both Mississippi and Florida. During the course of that trip, we became acquainted with the potential of the

seashore which the chairman of the full committee has outlined and we had an opportunity to learn the desires and aspirations of local citizens.

With this basic background, together with a preliminary Washington hearing, several members of the subcommittee were quite familiar with this proposal when we began to consider it in this Congress. Hearings were held on H.R. 10874 this year and most of the testimony was favorable to its enactment; however, some amendments were suggested.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

As a result of this combined experience, the members of the committee were able to agree on the basic terms of the bill without difficulty. The bill contains many of the usual provisions customarily included in national seashore authorizations. It establishes the boundaries for the seashore and extends to owners of residential properties located within the boundaries the usual right to retain a limited estate in their property if it is not needed for public use, development or administrative purposes. The bill also contains the normal provision for the regulation of fishing and hunting within the seashore to assure compliance with Federal and State laws and it provides for the administration of the area in accordance with general authority granted to the Secretary of the Interior to administer such areas.

As has been the case in comparable areas in other parts of the country, the bill provides for the appointment of an Advisory Commission for the seashore. Members of this Commission will serve without compensation—except for expenses—and will help to provide a liaison between the park service and the local communities involved.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

It should be noted that the committee adopted several amendments to perfect the bill. I would like to briefly enumerate them. First, with respect to the area included, the committee removed from the boundaries the areas which the Department indicated would not be needed to accomplish the objective of the seashore. In addition, the most controversial area within the original boundaries was a privately-owned island in Mississippi known as Cat Island. Because the committee concluded that its acquisition would be too costly and its contributions to the seashore too few, it was removed, also. This, of course, will result in a substantial reduction in the cost of the seashore.

Second, the provisions in the bill which provided for the possible future removal of minerals from the seashore were deleted from the bill because they were deemed incompatible with the purposes for which the seashore was to be established, but the committee recognized the importance of existing submerged pipelines which transport oil and gas resources from the Gulf of Mexico to refineries on the coast and it added a provision to assure the continued utilization of such pipelines subject to reasonable regulations established by the Secretary of the Interior.

Third, the committee approved a new

section 8 which provides that the appropriate portions of the seashore shall be reviewed for possible future designation as wilderness.

Finally, the committee adopted the usual provision limiting the amount authorized to be appropriated for land acquisition and development.

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the full committee indicated, authorization of this area will help meet a national need. It contains many natural, historic, and recreational values of national significance and is worthy of national recognition. Here, we have an opportunity to add a meaningful unit to our national heritage at a relatively low cost. Land acquisition should not exceed \$3,120,000 and the development program, which will be spread over the next 5 years, should not exceed \$14.8 million.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that H.R. 10874 is the product of the work of many individuals, but the two principal sponsors of the bill deserve a great deal of the credit for their constructive contributions. Without the patience and helpful guidance of the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER), it would have been very difficult to work out some of the problems which have now been resolved. Likewise, our friend from Florida (Mr. SIKES) was instrumental in helping to resolve one of the most controversial issues involving the cooperation of the State of Florida and its local governmental instrumentalities.

It is a special pleasure to join with these gentlemen in support of the enactment of H.R. 10874, as amended. I am sure the Members of the House will recognize the merits of this legislation and I recommend its approval.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I assure my colleagues of the extreme value of this particular piece of legislation. These islands actually form white sand ribbons between the green gulf waters and the blue bay waters. There is, as has been suggested, a tremendous part of American history in this area, because the military establishments go through the Spanish and French and British and American occupation of the area.

There is also an extremely interesting ecology which is present on all the islands, but especially on a couple of them. Through some freak of nature, although these bodies are located in salt water, artesian water flows under the bay and through the center of these islands, and therefore we have the interesting aspect in which we have a dune wall area, with the interior having a fresh water ecology, and from the top of the dunes outward to the bay and to the gulf, we have a saltwater ecology.

This bill does authorize a project which is of value to all Americans and I think it should be adopted overwhelmingly.

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

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that an organization has been circulating a rumor in his district

that the gentleman from Iowa has never taken any interest in matters of our national parks or recreation areas or matters of conservation. I, for one, would like at this time to pay tribute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL), as a member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee as being one of the most dedicated persons we have serving on that committee. The gentleman contributes tremendously to the discussion on all the bills and, in my opinion, he is an outstanding expert in the field of conservation.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I concur with the gentleman from Pennsylvania in his remarks about the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) has taken the time to give recognition to the dedication and ability of our colleague, Mr. KYL of Iowa.

I want to compliment him and associate myself with these remarks and also to commend Mr. KYL for the contribution he just rendered in support of the Gulf Island National Seashore project.

This rendering is a typical example of the indepth explanations we have come to appreciate from Mr. KYL. In my judgment, he is the most articulate Member we have in the Congress on ecological matters.

Mr. Speaker, I would further like to record a few remarks regarding the performance in our committee and on the floor of the House of our very able and distinguished colleague.

It appears, as we enter the political season, that certain individuals and/or organizations have taken it upon themselves to attack Members of Congress for purely political reasons and without regard for truth or fact.

One of those Members selected as a "target" in this campaign year is JOHN KYL from the Fourth District of the great State of Iowa. It has been my privilege to serve with Congressman KYL for 6 of the 8 years I have been in the House of Representatives. During this 91st Congress, I have sat on the Parks and Recreation, and Public Lands Subcommittee, and the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with JOHN KYL.

I have observed his day-to-day performance and I believe that if an impartial appraisal or description of his work on the committee could be obtained from other members of these committees, Democrats and Republicans alike, would agree that JOHN KYL is one of the most knowledgeable members of our committee. His exceptional intellectual capacity coupled with an objective, creative and constructive approach to all legislative proposals has contributed tremendously to improving the many park, recreation and conservation proposals that our committee considers on behalf of people, Congressman and conservation organizations throughout the country.

On many occasions, I have consulted

JOHN KYL—seeking his advice as we deliberate and evaluate legislation during hearings and markup sessions of our committee. Mr. KYL can always be counted on to give you a positive, forthright and honest pro and con response because he is known for his brilliance and more importantly, as a man who "does his homework" on every bill pending before the committee.

The respect and appreciation we have for JOHN KYL can not be adequately described or expressed in words. His depth of knowledge and broad perspective has served the cause of conservation in every section of this Nation.

In my congressional district in northern California, the Redwood National Park and Point Reyes National Seashore have been established. They were among the most unique, costly and controversial conservation proposals ever to be enacted by the Congress. His assistance, constructive criticisms and alternative suggestions proved invaluable as we advanced these bills to successful completion.

Our State of California and the Nation are deep in their debt to Congressman JOHN KYL, and the people of Iowa who send him to Congress for his extraordinary efforts in all conservation matters. I stand ready to reciprocate in matters affecting the people of the Fourth Congressional District.

It is this type of cooperation that prompts all of us in the Congress to want to help him advance his district's interests and projects.

Respect from and cooperation with our congressional colleagues is an absolute essential to effective service in the Congress. His people are being served very well.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time merely to express my deep appreciation for the dedicated work that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has done, and particularly, of course, the able and distinguished chairman of that committee, the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL, whom I am very happy always to commend publicly for his dedicated work and his statesmanship and his patriotism.

I should like to congratulate the gentleman at this time for just having been renominated for reelection. Regardless of the aisle which divides us here, I believe that Members from both sides of the aisle join me in that expression. We should like to have the gentleman here for many years to come.

I should also like to pay my respects to my colleague from Florida (Mr. SIKES) who has worked diligently on this matter, and to the chairman of the subcommittee, the very able and dedicated gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable ROY TAYLOR, who likewise has been very active, as well as to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL). The gentleman from Iowa, along with other members of the subcommittee, visited and inspected these islands. He was very much impressed and has been a strong advocate of the project.

Mr. Speaker, I should certainly be amiss if I did not also express my personal appreciation to the gentleman from

Pennsylvania, the ranking Republican on the committee, Mr. Saylor, for his valiant efforts and cooperation. Although Mr. Saylor was unable to make the inspection trip with Chairman ASPINALL and the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. Taylor, he has used his valuable influence to bring this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, if time permitted I should like to talk a little bit about this project, but I practiced law long enough to know that when one has the jury with him it is a good time to quit.

I want to express my appreciation again to all the members of that committee for their work in preserving this great natural asset for all of the people rather than for a privileged few.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the membership of this House is conscious of the fact that I am rather conservative when it comes to authorizing the expenditure of public funds. But, I hope that the membership likewise is conscious of my interest in the conservation of our natural resources. As one who has spent practically his whole life on the beautiful gulf coast of Mississippi, I have long been interested in preserving for the use of the general public in this ever-increasing population of this country these barrier islands. Therefore, I take some satisfaction in the fact that I may have contributed, as the cosponsor of this legislation, to this objective.

Again, I should like to pay my respects to the Director of our national parks, the Honorable George Hartzog, whom I succeeded in getting to visit these islands more than 2 years ago and who more than anybody else is responsible for this legislation. Mr. Hartzog came to the coast and envisioned the possibilities of the Gulf Islands National Seashore. If it had not been for his foresight and his cooperation, this bill would not have been here today.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I, too, commend the gentleman from Iowa on his statements. He is one of the most faithful and diligent members of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation. He visited the Gulf Islands area and participated in the field hearings there. He was present when hearings were held in Washington and the bill was considered and marked up by the subcommittee.

On all legislation dealing with national parks, national seashore areas, and similar areas, the gentleman from Iowa thinks for himself and has been one of the best informed, most constructive, and valuable members of the subcommittee.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: Page 2, lines 5 and 6, strike out "NS-GI-7100F, and dated May 1969;" and insert "NS-GI-7100H, and dated July 1970:".

Page 2, strike out all of line 7.

Page 2, line 8, strike out "(2) Cat," and insert "(1)".

Page 2, strike out all of lines 10 and 11 and

insert "(2) the eastern portion of Perdido Key in Florida;"

Page 2, strike out all of lines 12 and 13 and insert "(3) Santa Rosa Island in Florida;" and renumber the remaining subsections accordingly.

Page 2, line 20, strike out "Redoubt, and Fort McRee on Perdido Key," and insert "Redoubt".

Page 3, line 4, strike out "one hundred" and insert "one hundred and thirty-five".

Page 3, lines 8, 9 and 10, strike out "seashore; and not more than ten acres of land on or near Seville Square in Pensacola, for administrative or historical purposes." and insert "seashore".

Page 3, line 15 through page 5, line 2, strike out all of subsection (b) and reletter the following subsections accordingly.

Page 5, line 23 through page 6, line 9, strike out all of section 4 and insert a new Section 4 as follows:

"Sec. 4. Any acquisition of lands, waters, or interests therein shall not diminish any existing rights-of-way or easements which are necessary for the transportation of oil and gas minerals through the seashore which oil and gas minerals are removed from outside the boundaries thereof; and, the Secretary, subject to appropriate regulations for the protection of the natural and recreational values for which the seashore is established, shall permit such additional rights-of-way or easements as he deems necessary and proper."

Page 7, following line 17, insert a new section 8 reading as follows and renumber the following sections accordingly:

"Sec. B. Within four years from the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall review the area within the Gulf Island National Seashore and shall report to the President, in accordance with subsection 3(c) and 3(d) of the Wilderness Act (78 Stat. 890; 16 U.S.C. 1132 (c) and (d)), and recommend as to the suitability or non-suitability of any area within the seashore for preservation as wilderness, and any designation of any such area as a wilderness shall be accomplished in accordance with said subsections of the Wilderness Act."

Page 8, line 1, strike out "lakeshore" and insert in lieu thereof "seashore".

Page 9, strike out all of lines 4 through 6 and insert a new section 11 as follows:

"Sec. 11. There are authorized to be appropriated not more than \$3,120,000 for the acquisition of lands and interests in lands and not more than \$14,779,000 (1970 prices) for development, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the types of construction involved herein."

Mr. ASPINALL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc, that they be considered as having been read in full, and that they be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "To provide for the establishment of the Gulf Islands National Seashore, in the States of Florida and Mississippi, for the

recognition of certain historic values at Fort San Carlos, Fort Redoubt, Fort Barrancas, and Fort Pickins in Florida and Fort Massachusetts in Mississippi, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAVAJO INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 13001) to amend the act of June 13, 1962 (76 Stat. 96), with respect to the Navajo Indian irrigation project, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 13001

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of June 13, 1962 (76 Stat. 96), is amended as follows:

(a) By deleting "and" in the first sentence of section 3(a) immediately preceding "townships 27" and by inserting immediately preceding "New Mexico principal meridian", the following: "townships 26 and 27 north, range 11 west, and townships 24, 25, and 26 north, ranges 12 and 13 west,";

(b) By deleting "\$135,000,000 (June 1961 prices)" in the first sentence of section 7 and substituting in lieu thereof "\$175,000,000 (January 1966 prices)"; and

(c) By adding the following subsection to section 3:

"(d) The Secretary of the Interior shall compensate the persons whose grazing permits, licenses, or leases covering lands declared to be held in trust for the Navajo Tribe pursuant to section 3(a) of this Act are canceled after the date this subsection becomes effective. Such compensation shall be determined in accordance with the standards prescribed in the Act of July 9, 1942, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315q), and shall be paid from the moneys received by the United States from the Navajo Tribe for the full appraised value of such lands under the provisions of section 3(a)."

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

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 13001 is to permit certain changes in the plan of development, increase the appropriations authority, and otherwise modify the act authorizing the Navajo Indian irrigation project. To put this bill in proper perspective, it should be kept in mind that is not a Federal reclamation project; it is an Indian project even though actual design and construction work is being performed by the Bureau of Reclamation.

When the Navajo Indian irrigation project was authorized, it was included in the same bill with the San Juan-Chama project, a reclamation undertaking as a participating project of the Colorado River storage project. These programs were considered simultaneously because they both make use of the limited water supplies of the San Juan River system.

The plan, at that time, was to irri-

gate 110,680 acres of land with a gross water diversion of 508,000 acre-feet from the existing Navajo Reservoir, at an estimated cost of \$135,000,000 at 1961 price levels. Since that time, a number of things have happened, as follows:

First. Appropriations for the Indian project have lagged relative to those for the San Juan-Chama project. While this can be placed at the door of the Bureau of the Budget and not the Congress, it has raised suspicions on the part of the Navajos that the Government is not keeping faith with its agreements.

Second. There has been the same degree of inflation on cost estimated that we have experienced on other construction programs.

Third. Post authorization studies showed that much of the land intended to be irrigated was not suitable for irrigation and has had to be replaced with lands in other areas. This has involved designating for development additional lands which are not now within the reservation. The original plan contemplated service to some lands outside the reservation and established procedures for adding them to the reservation. The change in physical plan requires the addition of considerably more land to the reservation than was originally contemplated.

Against this background, H.R. 13001 will increase the appropriations authorization to \$206,000,000 at April 1970 price levels. This is an increase of \$71,000,000. About \$43,000,000 of this can be attributed to inflation or increases in price levels. The remainder can be attributed to plan changes brought about by the need to replace unsuitable lands to keep the scope of the project to agreed upon levels.

The bill will also authorize the Secretary to declare parts of eight additional townships now in the public domain to be transferred to the status of being held in trust for the Navaho Tribe. This increases to 16 the number of townships eligible for such treatment, there having been eight included in the original authorizing act.

The bill will also authorize certain payments to grazing permittees on the lands designated for transfer to trust status. These payments will not be for the value of the permit as such but merely for the reasonable value of permanent improvements placed on the lands by the permittee. It will be the obligation of the Navahos to reimburse the permittees for such values, but the amounts paid to the permittees will be deducted from the amounts the Tribe is obliged to pay the United States for the appraised value of the transferred lands.

The revisions of the plan of development that will be sanctioned by the passage of H.R. 13001 will not upset the pattern of water allocations that have been worked out in the various compacts and statutes governing water use in the Colorado River Basin. In fact, the consolidation of the arable lands of the Navajo Indian irrigation project into a more compact configuration suggests the possibility of the use of enclosed conduits which would result in less loss and opera-

tional waste. This would be a water savings as compared to the requirements for the originally authorized plan of development.

By the same token, the revised plan will have a beneficial effect on the quality of return flows from the project. The lands that will now be irrigated, if H.R. 13001 is enacted, are relatively less saline than the shale-based soils west of Rio Chaco and would thus be less inclined to contribute mineralization to the San Juan system.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize to the Members that this is an authorized project that could proceed to some level of completion whether this act is passed or not. What I am saying is that the money could be spent, and the water diverted by the Navajos, for implementing a relatively inferior plan. The Congress must not allow this to happen. Passage of this bill will make a good project for the benefit of the Indians and to the credit of the United States.

The bill has no opposition in the State or local area. The project still has a favorable benefit-cost ratio and is badly needed. In addition, the passage of the bill will represent tangible evidence of good faith on the part of the U.S. Government to proceed to completion with an irrigation project of the same scope as was envisioned by the previous authorization.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Mills). The time of the gentleman has expired.

(On request of Mr. Gross, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ASPINALL was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes).

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Do I understand or am I correct in assuming that this brings more land into production through irrigation?

Mr. ASPINALL. This will bring more land into production and cultivation for the Indian Navaho Tribe; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Would it be safe to assume that this land will produce crops which will be consumed there, or will they come into competition with surplus farm products elsewhere?

Mr. ASPINALL. Knowing the land, and knowing the eight additional townships that are authorized by this legislation, the other eight having already been authorized, and knowing also the land that is withdrawn from the original legislation, west of the Chaco River, I am of the opinion that these lands will not come into competition as far as their products are concerned with other than the present agricultural development of that area.

These lands will be used primarily for Indian resource operations.

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

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that when this project first came to the floor for original authorization I opposed the bill because at that time I felt, and said, that this was a project to bring water to a city, and it came to the floor under a Navajo blanket, and I think that my prognostication was true.

But at this point everyone has benefited except the Navajos and, therefore, I must support this bill to bring full benefit to the people who were promised assistance in the first place.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Colorado that page 3 of the report refers to—and the gentleman mentioned it in his remarks—the authorization of payments to the holders of grazing permits on federally owned lands.

How are those permits handled? Do the permit holders have some sort of a vested interest? What will the Government be paying for?

Mr. ASPINALL. These are permits issued by the Bureau of Land Management at the present time, which lands will be transferred to the Indians upon certain payments.

Now, what we are asking for here, if I remember correctly, is that the people who are on these permit lands at present have some value for permit land improvements. These permittees will be reimbursed for such improvements. As far as the improvements are concerned the Indians themselves will pay for the improvements. I believe my statement is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If the gentleman will yield, the answer is yes to his unasked question; the fair market value of the improvements are all that would be considered.

Mr. GROSS. But are we paying for something which the Government could and should recover without payment?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The Indian tribe will pay all of the improvement costs.

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about the payment—

Mr. ASPINALL. If the gentleman will permit me, the gentleman wants to know if we are placing any value on the permit itself by this legislation. It is my understanding that we are not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has again expired.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in general support of this legislation.

The Navajo Indian irrigation project was originally authorized by the act of June 13, 1962. The project was authorized at that time as a participating project of the Colorado River storage project, for the purpose of furnishing irrigation water to approximately 110,630 acres of land in the State of New Mexico. A portion of these lands are federally owned and located outside the Indian

reservation. The act authorizing the project authorized acquisition of these Federal lands for inclusion in the Navajo Indian irrigation project.

Subsequently, a restudy of the Navajo Indian irrigation project indicated that the federally owned lands in the western end of the project were not suitable for sustained irrigation and that the total estimated costs of the project are no longer sufficient to complete the project.

As a result of this restudy of the project, the nonirrigable lands to the west of the project were excluded from the original project area and an equivalent alternate area capable of sustained irrigation was located to the east of the project. Consolidation of the project area by the inclusion of this alternate land required corresponding changes in the project development plan and the need for this amendatory legislation.

H.R. 13001, as amended, provides for the acquisition of certain additional federally owned lands to be included in the Navajo Indian irrigation project in lieu of the lands excluded from the project. The bill increases the appropriation authorization from \$135 million to \$206 million on the basis of current price levels, and authorizes the payment of compensation to grazing permittees for the reasonable value of range improvements of a permanent nature.

It is this last provision of H.R. 13001, as amended, relating to the compensation of grazing permittees which causes me some concern and reservation. H.R. 13001 authorizes the payment of compensation by the Navajo Tribe to grazing permittees for the reasonable value of permanent range improvements when the grazing lands are needed for irrigation purposes, and permits the Navajo Tribe to deduct the amount so paid when paying the United States for the appraised value of the land. The Taylor Grazing Act specifically provides that issuance of a grazing permit shall not create any right, title, interest, or estate in or to the lands. On the other hand, there is an established practice recognized by Federal regulations, I am told, which does recognize payment for improvements when lands are disposed of by the United States. I am not informed if this practice is followed with regard to grazing permits. The question is, how far can we go in compromising the legal principle established by the Taylor Grazing Act?

If a grazing permit is only a privilege that can be withdrawn or terminated at any time for any use by the sovereign without the payment of compensation, it follows as night follows day, that any range improvements, permanent or otherwise, by the permittees, are placed thereon at his own peril and risk of loss. I see no reason why the United States should indirectly compensate the grazing permittee in this instance.

With this reservation, Mr. Speaker, I support the passage of this legislation.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the gentleman's very clear explanation. I thor-

oughly agree with the gentleman. I know of no reason why anyone should pay these grazing permit holders for improvements or anything else that are put on the land.

If the Government wants that land, it ought to recover it promptly for whatever purposes it needs it.

Mr. SAYLOR. I agree thoroughly with my colleague from Iowa. The Government should not have to pay. The Indians should not be entitled to charge the United States for whatever they have to pay for any permittee because indirectly, therefore, we are paying for this project.

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly right.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAYLOR

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: Page 2, line 14, following line 14, add a new Section 2 to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. All identifiable return flows of irrigation water furnished to the lands authorized for acquisition and inclusion in the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project pursuant to Section 1 of this Act and in accordance with the Act of April 11, 1965 (70 Stat. 105), as amended by the Act of June 13, 1962 (76 Stat. 96; 43 U.S.C. 620-620c), shall be treated for the purpose of abating pollution and improving water quality in such manner as determined by the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to carry out the congressional intent to abate water pollution and improve our environment. This Nation is on the threshold of a major attack on water pollution. The Council on Environmental Quality in its recent report recommended that a strong and consistent Federal policy should be developed to control water pollution and insure effective enforcement of water quality standards.

The place to begin is here in our consideration of legislation authorizing Federal water resource developments—be they large or small. And, the time to begin is now. This is essentially what the amendment I have offered does, by writing into basic law the requirement that all identifiable flows of water from works and facilities authorized in this Federal project shall be inspected and treated for the purpose of abating water pollution and improving water quality.

This is not a complex amendment. The amendment merely requires: First, that the flows of water be identified from the works and facilities authorized in the act, if they cannot be identified then there is nothing to be done; and, second, if the flows of water can be identified, the amendment requires that the water flow be inspected for water pollution. If water pollution is found then the amendment requires that the water flows be treated to abate the pollution and improve the water quality. All this is to be done in such a manner as is determined by the Secretary of the Interior. If the Secretary of the Interior does not have the money or manpower within his Department or the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, then the

Secretary, I am certain, will be more than willing to request more money and manpower from the Congress.

I am aware that there are those who will rise in opposition to this amendment and propose arguments against its adoption on the basis that this amendment has no place in this little project. I would point out to my colleagues that this Congress passed Public Law 91-190, commonly known as the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. The amendment which I have offered is merely a step, a small step, in carrying out the congressional declaration of a national environmental policy. I would also say to my colleagues to beware of those who clamor for the improvement of our environment, so long as it is not required in their own backyard.

Improvement of our environment, abating water pollution, and improving water quality are all part of the same problem. If we in the Congress are to carry out our commitment to improve the environment then we must begin by requiring that Federal water resource developments, of large, small, or medium size, be continually monitored for the purpose of abating water pollution and improving water quality.

If we are to have a national policy on the environment, then the Federal Government should set the example.

Mr. Speaker, as explained before, this is the amendment that I would like to see in all of these bills. However, as developed in the conference on the Narrows project, I was not able to convince the Members of the House and Senate conferees that that amendment should be included, and we have changed and adopted some other language. I therefore ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAYLOR

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: On page 3, after line 13, insert a section 2 to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. The Navajo Indian irrigation project shall be operated in such manner that identifiable flows of water will not cause the project to be in violation of water quality standards promulgated pursuant to the Water Quality Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 903)."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker and members of the committee, this amendment is probably surplusage, because the language of the amendment does not require anything more legally than is already required in the Water Quality Act of 1965. What this amendment does do, is that it imposes a positive Federal requirement on the operation of this project to carry out the national policy to abate water pollution. As a matter of principle I offer the amendment, which is the same amendment that I offered to the other three projects.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania meets with the approval of the Members on this side of the aisle. We have no objection to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of this legislation, I am pleased to speak in support of H.R. 13001, to amend the act of June 13, 1962, with respect to the Navajo Indian irrigation project.

Enactment of this legislation will be another important and vital step in progressing toward the completion of the Navajo Indian irrigation project which was begun in 1962, with a target date for completion of 1979. The project has suffered setbacks because of lack of proper funding in the past, however, this year, \$7.5 million has been approved for the project and we are optimistic that funding will be even greater next year.

As a result of the delays in adequate funding to maintain construction at the level anticipated when the project was initiated, there is the resultant increase in construction costs which is the reason for this request for an increase in authorization for continued funding of this project—one of the most necessary, if not the most vital project to bring self-supporting economy to the Navajo Indians residing on the vast Navajo Reservation—and to alleviate the present conditions of unbelievable poverty.

The Navajo Indians are not looking for a welfare handout. They are expecting from the Government of the United States fulfillment of the promises made by this Government which date from the 1868 treaty. The Navajo Indian irrigation project is also an obligation of this Government to the Navajo people.

The bill now before the committee will do three things. Under the first provision, it will authorize the incorporation of lands from eight townships not included in the original authorization for the Navajo Indian irrigation project by the act of June 13, 1962, as a participating part of the project of the Colorado River storage project. Restudy of the 110,630-acre project indicated that certain reservation lands west of the Chaco Wash, and included in the original feasibility study were not suitable for sustained irrigation, and these lands were removed from the project. To replace this acreage with an equivalent area, land will be included in the project in an area east of the Chaco Wash which contains soils of an equal or better classification than the lands excluded from the project, and will provide a more compact area. However, some of these new lands are outside of the reservation, and this amendatory legislation is necessary before these lands may be acquired.

The second provision in this legislation relates to grazing permits, licenses, or leases on lands which are taken for

the project, and the authority for the Secretary of the Interior to proceed in this area.

The third and most important provision is the amendment of the authorizing act to increase the previous authorized appropriations from \$135 million to \$206 million.

The Navajo Indian irrigation project, upon completion, will have a capability for the irrigation of over 110,000 acres of land both within and adjacent to the Navajo Indian Reservation. It is estimated it will support some 1,120 new farms for Navajo families. In increased employment opportunities, it has been projected it will provide employment for 8,841 Navajos with an additional benefit and/or part-time employment for 33,000 Navajos or approximately 28 percent of the Navajo population.

As I have said before, this project is of vital importance to the Navajo Tribe and to the economy of northwest New Mexico and the Four Corners area. The economic hopes for the future of the Navajo Tribe center on this project to develop vast wastelands on the reservation into productive irrigated land.

The Navajo people looked forward eagerly to an improvement in their economic status on the reservation when the initial approval of the project was given by the authorization of 1962. But hope has waned with the delays in funding. The Congress is aware of the deplorable conditions under which these people now exist, and knows the disappointment which the Navajo Indians feel as the years have passed and the completion date for this project is extended.

We have a definite obligation as Members of Congress to fund the Navajo Indian irrigation project as required to completion. We have this obligation as a nation. Passage of this legislation is one more step, and a necessary step, in this direction.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate, as neighbor to the west, our colleague for sharing responsibility for the Navajo Tribe. I, too, wish to express my enthusiasm for the propriety of this legislation and the recognition of this Congress that the original legislation, while excellent in intent, simply did not fill the bill.

This legislation will provide not only useful water, but also useful land upon which to use the water.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13001 is a bill to amend the act which authorized the Navajo Indian irrigation project in 1962. It is needed to clarify the status of the project, to conform the plan of development in accordance with postauthorization studies, and to symbolize the pub-

lic commitment to the Navajo Nation to complete the Navajo Indian irrigation project.

The Navajo Indian irrigation project was authorized in 1962. It was included in the same bill that authorized the San Juan-Chama reclamation project. These projects both make use of the waters of the San Juan River system, a tributary of the Colorado River in the State of New Mexico. Simultaneous authorization of the two projects accomplished a division of the water resources between the Navajo people on one hand and the non-Indian community on the other.

In practical effect, Mr. Speaker, the Navajo people in accepting the Navajo Indian irrigation project have agreed not to assert any further claim against the waters of the San Juan River system. What remains to be done is for the Federal Government to prove that it intends to go forward with its share of the bargain. This is particularly so now that the San Juan-Chama project is essentially completed and ready for service. Passage of H.R. 13001 will furnish the required proof.

Let us examine briefly just what the Navajos were promised. It is really quite simple—an irrigation project of not less than 110,630 acres, for which the Navajos would be entitled to divert 508,000 acre-feet of water annually from Navajo reservoir of the Colorado River storage project system.

At the time of authorization, there was presented to the Congress by the Bureau of Indian Affairs a plan of development estimated to cost \$135,000,000. The Congress determined that postauthorization studies and construction administration should be performed by the Bureau of Reclamation, and that agency has been in charge of the technical work since the first funding became available.

These studies have resulted in the finding that much of the land originally intended to be served, particularly in the western reaches of the project area, is simply not up to standards of arability and that which remains in an arable status west of Rio Chaco would be inordinately expensive to serve and operate. Accordingly, the Bureau of Reclamation has concentrated on locating replacement land resources in the eastern sector of the project area. While these lands have been located, their service will involve more cost for pumping and will also mean that more extensive revisions to the Navajo Reservation boundary must be made to bring all of the lands into the reservation in trust.

These changes in plan together with the effects of inflation have now increased the estimated cost of the project from \$135,000,000—June 1961 prices—to \$206,000,000—April 1970 prices. This is a total increase of \$71,000,000 of which \$43,000,000 is attributable to inflation and \$28,000,000 is attributable to changes and refinements in the plan of development. Enactment of H.R. 13001 will have the effect of conveying congressional sanction to the revised plan as well as authorizing the necessary increased appropriations. Despite these in-

creases, current study shows that the project is still fully justified with a benefit-cost ratio of 1.39 to 1.

The provisions of H.R. 13001 will also authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer portions of eight additional townships of public domain lands to the Navajo Reservation to be held in trust for the Navajo Tribe. This brings to 16 the number of townships from which arable lands may be selected for inclusion in the project. This change in land base is, of course, made necessary by the determination on nonarability concerning much of the lands west of Rio Chaco.

The original authorizing language of the Navajo Indian project provided for the tribe to pay the United States for the appraised value of any lands transferred to the reservation in trust pursuant to its terms. No provision was made for extinguishing rights of permittees then enjoying the use of such public domain lands. The enactment of H.R. 13001 will require that the fair market value of permanent improvements made by permittees of lands designated for transfer be paid to the permittee with a corresponding reduction in the payment made to the United States. This provision recognizes the investments which have been made by grazing permittees and which have enhanced the value of the public lands without involving any more obligation on the part of the Navajo people than they would incur under the term of the legislation as it now stands.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair bill, one with no hidden aspects and one which all Members can support as being consistent with our commitments to the Navajos. I urge each and every Member of the House to give their complete support to its enactment.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, strike out all of line 2 and insert in lieu thereof "thereof \$206,000,000 (April 1970 prices)"; and".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, strike out all of lines 4 through 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(d) Each permit that is in effect on lands declared to be held in trust for the Navajo Tribe pursuant to section 3(a) of this Act shall continue in effect for the term thereof unless the land is needed for irrigation purposes, subject to regulations applicable to permits of Indian lands, and upon its expiration it shall only be renewed on an annual basis until the land is required for irrigation purposes. When, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, such land is required for irrigation purposes, the Secretary shall notify the permittee and the permit shall be deemed to be cancelled, with no right of appeal. The permittee shall be compensated by the Navajo Tribe for the reasonable value of any range improvements of a permanent nature placed on the lands under authority

of a permit or agreement with the United States, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior. Amounts paid to the United States by the Navajo Tribe out of tribal funds for the full appraised value of lands declared to be held in trust for the Navajo Tribe pursuant to section 3(a) of this Act shall be reduced by the amount of compensation paid by the Navajo Tribe to permittees pursuant to this subsection."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1188, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is discharged from further consideration of the bill S. 203.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. JOHNSON of California: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 203 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 13001, as passed, as follows:

That the Act of June 13, 1962 (76 Stat. 96), is amended as follows:

(a) By deleting "and" in the first sentence of section 3(a) immediately preceding "townships 27" and by inserting immediately preceding "New Mexico principal meridian", the following: "townships 26 and 27 north, range 11 west, and townships 24, 25, and 26 north, ranges 12 and 13 west";

(b) By deleting "\$135,000,000 (June 1961 prices)" in the first sentence of section 7 and substituting in lieu thereof "\$206,000,000 (April 1970 prices)"; and

(c) By adding the following subsection to section 3:

"(d) Each permit that is in effect on lands declared to be held in trust for the Navajo Tribe pursuant to section 3(a) of this Act shall continue in effect for the term thereof unless the land is needed for irrigation purposes, subject to regulations applicable to permits of Indian lands, and upon its expiration it shall only be renewed on an annual basis until the land is required for irrigation purposes. When, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, such land is required for irrigation purposes, the Secretary shall notify the permittee and the permit shall be deemed to be canceled, with no right of appeal. The permittee shall be compensated by the Navajo Tribe for the reasonable value of any range improvements of a permanent nature placed on the lands under authority of a permit or agreement with the United States, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior. Amounts paid to the United States by the Navajo Tribe out of tribal funds for the full appraised value of lands declared to be held in trust for the Navajo Tribe pursuant to section 3(a) of this Act shall be reduced by the amount of compensation paid by the Navajo Tribe to permittees pursuant to this subsection."

Sec. 2. The Navajo Indian irrigation project shall be operated in such manner that identifiable flows of water will not cause the project to be in violation of water quality standards promulgated pursuant to the Water Quality Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 903).

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time,

and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 13001) was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 17570. An act to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend and improve the existing program relating to education, research, training, and demonstrations in the fields of heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other related diseases, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 17570) entitled "An act to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend and improve the existing program relating to education, research, training, and demonstrations in the fields of heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other related diseases, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. PELL, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. SAXBE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3619. An act to revise and expand Federal programs for relief from the effects of major disasters, and for other purposes.

PROVIDING FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF APOSTLE ISLANDS NATIONAL LAKESHORE, WISCONSIN

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 9306) to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

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

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 292]

Addabbo	Farbstein	Nix
Alexander	Feighan	O'Neal, Ga.
Anderson,	Findley	Ottinger
Calif.	Fish	Patman
Anderson, III.	Flynt	Pelly
Anderson,	Fountain	Pepper
Tenn.	Fraser	Philbin
Ashbrook	Frey	Pickle
Ayres	Friedel	Podell
Baring	Fulton, Tenn.	Powell
Barrett	Fuqua	Price, Tex.
Beall, Md.	Gialmo	Pryor, Ark.
Bell, Calif.	Gilbert	Purcell
Berry	Goldwater	Qule
Bingham	Gubser	Quillen
Blackburn	Hagan	Rees
Blatnik	Hall	Reid, N.Y.
Boggs	Halpern	Reifel
Boland	Hanna	Rhodes
Brasco	Hansen, Wash.	Riegler
Bray	Harsha	Rivers
Brock	Harvey	Roberts
Broomfield	Hawkins	Rogers, Colo.
Brown, Ohio	Hays	Rooney, Pa.
Buchanan	Hébert	Roudebush
Burke, Fla.	Hicks	Rousselot
Burleson, Tex.	Hollfield	Ruppe
Burton, Utah	Howard	St Germain
Bush	Hutchinson	Sandman
Button	Jonas	Satterfield
Byrnes, Wis.	Jones, Ala.	Scherle
Cabell	Jones, Tenn.	Scheuer
Camp	Karth	Schneebell
Carey	Keith	Schwengel
Casey	King	Sisk
Celler	Kluczynski	Skubitz
Chisholm	Kuykendall	Smith, Iowa
Clancy	Landgrebe	Snyder
Clark	Landrum	Stephens
Clay	Langen	Stokes
Corman	Long, La.	Stratton
Coughlin	Lowenstein	Stubblefield
Cowger	Lujan	Stuckey
Cramer	Lukens	Taft
Crane	McCarthy	Teague, Calif.
Culver	McCulloch	Teague, Tex.
Cunningham	McMillan	Thompson, Ga.
Daddario	Macdonald,	Tunney
Davis, Ga.	Mass.	Van Deerlin
Dawson	MacGregor	Watson
de la Garza	Melcher	Welcker
Delaney	Meskill	Whalen
Dent	Miller, Calif.	White
Diggs	Mink	Wiggins
Dingell	Mize	Wilson, Bob
Dowdy	Mollohan	Wilson,
Edwards, Ala.	Monagan	Charles H.
Edwards, La.	Morse	Wold
Esch	Morton	Wyatt
Evans, Colo.	Murphy, N.Y.	Yatron
Evins, Tenn.	Nedzi	Young
Fallon	Nelsen	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). On this rollcall 248 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PROVIDING FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF APOSTLE ISLANDS NATIONAL LAKESHORE, WIS.

Mr. TAYLOR. 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. 9306) to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes.

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

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. 9306, with Mr. PRICE of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chairman recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 9306 authorizes the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin. While this proposal has been somewhat controversial, most members of the committee agree that the lakeshore which the bill establishes will be a significant addition to the national park system.

FEATURES OF THE LAKESHORE

Basically, the lakeshore will consist of two units. The mainland unit, which will be located in Bayfield County, comprises approximately 2,500 acres and 10 miles of rugged Lake Superior shoreline. This area contains many outstanding natural features associated with the natural and geological history of the country's northland.

It is expected that this area will be the center attraction for the bulk of the visiting public. Camping, hiking, picnicking, sightseeing, and fishing will all be popular activities and the area should be useful as well for winter sports and outings. With snowmobiles increasing in popularity, it is expected that trails will be developed for their use.

In addition to the mainland unit, the lakeshore will include 20 of the 22 islands located along the coastline. Of the two excluded, one is highly developed and would require an unreasonably large expenditure for land acquisition; the other is a small, undeveloped island which is isolated from the lakeshore as it is now being recommended.

Altogether, the islands unit totals about 39,500 acres of land. Most of these areas have some seasonal residents, but few people live there on a year-round basis.

If H.R. 9306 is enacted, the members of the committee expect the islands to be developed in a manner compatible with their natural values. This will involve the construction of boat docks, campgrounds, hiking trails, and other suitable public facilities. Access to these areas will be limited to the water and, in all likelihood, privately operated excursion boats will be available to transport the people around the islands.

INDIAN LANDS QUESTION

Most of the controversy concerning this legislation has involved the question of the inclusion of Indian lands. Originally, the proposal included parts of the Indian reservations, but the bill recommended by the committee specifically excludes all lands held in trust for the Indian people residing in the area. Some lands are included in the lakeshore which have been sold by the Indians and which are technically non-Indian lands

located within their reservations. But it should be emphasized that the boundaries of the lakeshore are drawn to exclude all Indian trust lands and section 2 expressly provides that no trust lands are to be acquired. There is, however, an exception to this policy provided in the bill which would permit the acquisition of two small shoreline tracts if the Indian owners desire to sell.

May I advise my colleagues that as the bill came before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs the National Park Service suggested that a large area along the lakeshore belonging to the Indians be covered into the proposed national park so that a road might be built along the lakeshore and that the Indians could be given certain benefits or opportunities because they would be living adjacent to the proposed lakeshore. They would have exceptional opportunities to serve the public. This proposal of the Department of the Interior was frowned upon by the committee after the extensive hearings which we held. We excluded this possibility and included only the lands that I have heretofore referred to in my statement.

Now, of course, these members of the Indian tribe are just like all of the rest of us. If they can see any benefits coming to them they would like to have those benefits. As I understand it this great opposition that has been generated concerning which our friend from Iowa has advised us—and, I think there is no question about the authenticity of the telegrams that he has in his possession—it is promoted by a national Indian organization. The Indians involved in the area in my opinion desire to have their cake and eat it at the same time. They do not desire any development to take place that would serve anybody else except themselves. If we are going to serve the public in this particular area with the facilities which are suggested in this legislation, and if the National Government is to spend money for the development of the lakeshore facility, then it is my opinion that it is about time the Indian population is fitting itself into the general complex of the general population. We have seen that in the past that the tribe involved has seen fit to sell their lands to non-Indians. Presently the lands which we have involved in this bill are not Indian owned as far as trust lands are concerned. The great opposition that we currently have simply comes from the fact that the Indians would like to have back the lands that they have heretofore sold to non-Indians. How they are going to get it is not apparent to me after hearing the testimony. The only way they can possibly get it is to have some kind of a development where they can take advantage of such development or an outright grant from the Federal Government itself. I do not think that this outright grant is forthcoming. To me it just makes sense that a facility such as is contemplated in this legislation will bring benefits to the Indians who heretofore have been for this legislation and recently have become opposed to it for some reason or other. It just makes sense that we go ahead and develop it as a

national park facility and then permit the Indians to receive the benefits which naturally come to the people of an area such as this.

COST

Originally the anticipated costs of this project involved some \$13,310,000 for land acquisition and development. Because of the changes made by the committee, these anticipated outlays have been reduced. Appropriations are limited by the bill to no more than \$4,250,000 for land acquisition and not more than \$5 million for development.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 9306 has been carefully considered by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. We feel that it constitutes the best possible national lakeshore and that future generations will appreciate the fact that this modest amount of Lake Superior shoreline has been set aside for the recreational enjoyment of the American people.

I fully support H.R. 9306, as amended, and urge its approval by the House.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation as it is now presented. I believe that the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has done all the compromising on this bill that is possible if you want to have a truly viable unit of the national park system.

Mr. Chairman, I wish that I had a map larger than this, but I would like to call the attention of the Members to this map of the area. It is the northern tip of Bayfield County in Wisconsin, and the Apostle Islands in Lake Superior. The bill as we presented it would include 20 of the islands that are offshore. We excluded Madeline Island and Long Island, two of the Apostle Islands, because of their development.

When the bill was originally presented to our committee it included all of the Bad River Indian Reservation, the area that is marked in yellow at the bottom of this map. It also included all of the Red Cliff Indian Reservation, which is marked in yellow along the lakeshore.

Now, because of the opposition of these two tribes of Indians our committee has excluded all of the land area in the Bad River Indian Reservation. We have excluded all of the Red Cliff Indian Reservation that is still in Indian ownership. But the remarkable thing about those who oppose the bill now, say that because we have included some land that is still presently within the original boundaries of the Red Cliff Indian Reservation we should exclude that land also.

Now, what is this land that we have included? The Indian tribes, the Red Cliff Band of Indians in Wisconsin, by their own tribal action in bygone years and with the full approval of the Indian Bureau allocated to individual Indian members of that tribe tracts of land within their reservation. They gave them deeds for it similar to the deeds you have in the property you own. And these Indians have either moved away or sold the land to other people, so that it is no longer in Indian ownership.

All of the land that is within the area that we now have in this proposed lake-

shore is owned either by the State of Wisconsin, the Federal Government, or by private individuals.

Very frankly, some of the folks who support the minority views that have been filed say that sometime in the future, if the United States will establish the Apostle Islands Lakeshore, the Indians may get enough money some day to go to those people who own the land that was formerly in the reservation and buy it back and put it in Indian ownership.

I think it was aptly described by the chairman of our full committee—this is an example of a group of people who want to have their cake and to eat it too.

Now I was impressed, as were a number of other members on the committee, when we began to get telegrams from all over the United States from all of the Indian tribes and Indian councils to the effect that they were opposed to this bill. Those telegrams were sent to the members of the committee.

I would like to tell you that somebody slipped along the line. After all, you sometimes think that these Indians in the West and in the South and in the central part of our country have a common interest and, therefore, it was because they belonged to the National Association of Indians that they got the word.

But lo and behold, the Western Union one day made a mistake. I found out about one of the telegrams that was delivered to me, that the telegram was to be charged not to the Indian tribe out in California that sent me the telegram, but it was to be charged to a man who is a white man and lives in the area and who, in my opinion, is trying to use the Indians. In other words, this is not a spontaneous group of telegrams that have come from the Indian tribes who are looking out for their Indian brethren. These are telegrams that have been inspired by a white man who is in the real estate business up in that area and who is trying to use the Red Cliff Band of Indians for his own use and benefit.

I can say to the members of this committee, I would urge you to vote against any amendments that are offered to this bill and to support the bill as it was reported by the committee. We will then have a viable unit of our national park system.

I urge that all amendments that are proposed other than those adopted in the committee be rejected and that the bill as presented be passed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER).

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill which would establish an Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin.

This legislation was introduced early in the 91st Congress by Congressman ROBERT KASTENMEIER, who was joined by several other Members of the House. Similar legislation was introduced in the Senate by Senator GAYLORD NELSON.

This proposal has had a long history, and over time it has acquired a long list of supporters, including newspapers, civic and business groups, agriculture and labor organizations, and conservation groups on the local, State, and national levels.

Congress first authorized a study for an Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in 1930. In his February 1966 conservation report to the Congress, President Lyndon Johnson asked that planning for the project be completed as soon as possible. In January 1967, President Johnson listed the Apostle Islands proposal as one of the top four priorities for national park authorization. The Senate has passed this legislation in 1967 and 1969.

Hopefully, the 91st Congress will recognize the beauty and uniqueness of this region and will bring to fruition the work which began 40 years ago to establish a national lakeshore in northern Wisconsin.

The lakeshore would include 41,966 acres of land along the shores of Lake Superior. It would provide an unspoiled and scenic area for thousands of persons in the Midwest who are searching for more and more outdoor recreation areas. Most importantly, this proposal preserves the natural beauty which surrounds the Apostle Islands.

A national lakeshore in this area would also be economically beneficial for an area which can badly use such economic assistance. An indepth study of the proposal by Prof. I. V. Fine, of the University of Wisconsin, has indicated that the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore would generate more than \$7 million a year in spending for this area. It would bring 1 million visitors there, and each would be treated to a unique and beautiful area for hunting, fishing, boating, or hiking.

Consideration has and will continue to be given to protecting the historic rights of the Indians of this area. The lakeshore contains no Indian lands held in a trust status, or as far as can be reasonably ascertained, lands individually owned by any Indian.

If for no other reason, the Apostle Islands and the surrounding lakeshore should be conserved for conversation's sake. Recreational areas such as this are getting more and more scarce, and more and more expensive. The preservation of the Apostle Islands now will insure to future generations a recreation of enormous beauty. I am hopeful the House will see fit to enact this legislation which will make it possible.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore proposal has been 40 years in the making. Back in 1930, the 71st Congress authorized the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the advisability of establishing an Apostle Islands National Park in Wisconsin. House passage of H.R. 9306 will fulfill a long-held dream that many conservationists, in Wisconsin and throughout the Nation, have held for all these years.

I wish to compliment my chairman of our full committee (Mr. ASPINALL), my National Parks Subcommittee chairman (Mr. TAYLOR), the gentleman from Penn-

sylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) and all my colleagues on the Interior Committee. Their patience, understanding, and willingness to assist in the final drafting of H.R. 9306, have made it possible for the Apostle Islands legislation to reach the House floor. I also want to commend my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. O'KONSKI) for his steadfast support for the Apostle Islands proposal.

Mr. Chairman, situated in northern Wisconsin along the shores of Lake Superior, the proposed 41,966-acre Apostle Islands National Lakeshore contains a unique collection of 20 islands unrivaled by any other island chain located within the continental boundaries of the United States. The lakeshore proposal also includes another rare and rapidly vanishing resource, undeveloped shoreline, approximately 10 $\frac{1}{4}$ miles, bordering on Lake Superior.

The Apostle Islands are an archipelago. The corrosive glacial streams of the last ice age cut them off from the massive sandstone blocks of Wisconsin shore, and they are clustered about the blunt-tipped, lofty-ridged Bayfield Peninsula. The islands are covered with a luxurious growth of mixed hardwoods and conifers. Their shores are characterized by steep slopes with many cliffs where the waves of Lake Superior have frequently carved arches, bastions, caverns, and towering walls. Along the protected bays and inlets are many magnificent white sand beaches. The islands remain almost in their primitive state, abounding in birds and mammals. The lakeshore unit has spectacular arches, caves, cliffs, and bays, eroded from solid rock by wave and stream action over thousands of years. These geological formations alternate with secluded sand and pebble beaches. Behind the shoreline stands a dense forest of spruce, fir, pine, and northern hardwoods.

The hand of man is not apparent here. He has made his few scratches, but he has not defiled this place and this place is the better for it. This unspoiled backyard of our upper Midwest is only hours away and within easy driving distance from the heavily populated areas of Milwaukee, Chicago, Detroit, Duluth, and the Twin Cities of Minneapolis-St. Paul. The lakeshore also is accessible from all parts of the country.

The increasing mobility of the American citizenry, coupled with its increase in population, demands farsighted planning and implementation of public recreation areas. A resource of the majesty, scope, and historic and geologic value, as the Apostle Islands, calls for nothing less than protection and management by the Federal Government.

The islands and the adjacent shoreline invite almost every outdoor recreation activity possible in the northern Great Lakes region: camping, boating, hiking, hunting, skimboarding, fishing, nature study, photography, beachcombing, picnicking, and sightseeing. With many miles of island and mainland shoreline, broken by vast areas of open water, relatively large numbers of visitors can be accommodated without crowding.

The Apostle Islands region is rich in history. It was Indian country before

Columbus set sail from the Old World. The Chippewas settled on the shore of Lake Superior. Then, the fabled French voyageurs, looking for the Northwest Passage to the Orient, appeared in the 17th century. Eventually the French and British would fight each other for these lands. The French would lose, and then the British would lose to a new breed, the Americans. The Apostle Islands area became a thriving community settled by lumberjacks, miners and homesteaders. Today, however, the region is sparsely populated by our present standards.

The enactment of this legislation would also provide significant benefits to the Upper Great Lakes States through the immense economic potential of tourism and outdoor recreation. The Apostle Islands National Lakeshore will help the depressed condition of northern Wisconsin by revitalizing its sagging economy, which, in the past, had been dependent upon lumbering and mining. The bulk of the tourists will come in the summer months. However, skimming and skiing activity is developing very rapidly so there will be lots of winter use in the area. Important as these economic considerations are, however, they should be secondary to preserving this remarkable area.

The Apostle Islands National Lakeshore proposal has received impressive endorsements from more than 180 various Wisconsin and national groups, including numerous civil business, professional, labor, farm and conservation organizations. The Advisory Board of National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments has recommended its establishment. It is supported by this administration as it was by the previous administration.

Mr. Chairman, only a few areas of the quality of the Apostle Islands still remain. Any delay in protecting them will serve only to diminish their uniqueness. Unfortunately, we have watched too many of the resources of our environment weaken and die over the years. In preserving the Apostle Islands region, we are saving a priceless legacy for future generations. It would be nice to leave them this area, unspoiled.

The dissenting views on H.R. 9306 use two contradictory arguments to oppose the measure. On the one hand, they object to the bill because it involves land on the Red Cliff Reservation, while, on the other hand, they object because it reduces the size of the project to avoid infringing on Indian rights.

The legislation in no way violates the 1854 Treaty with the Chippewas of Lake Superior. The Indians, voluntarily, sold the 1,541.4 acres of alienated land within the boundaries of the Red Cliff Reservation that will be included in the lakeshore—1,541.4 acres—57.4 acres are the property of Bayfield and Russell townships, about 350 acres are Bayfield county land, and about 1,124 acres are private lands, not owned by any Indian, as an individual. The Red Cliff hope to reacquire the alienated lands, possibly, with funds awarded in claims now pending before the Indian Claims Commission. According to the Indian Claims Commission, however, the Red Cliff Band

is one of several bands of Chippewa Indians included in competing claims.

"Assuming judgments in favor of the plaintiffs are eventually reported to the Congress in some of the above mentioned dockets, so many Chippewa bands are named in the claims and so involved is their interrelationship, it can reasonably be predicted that it will not be known with certainty who the beneficiaries will be until after the Congress has enacted legislation providing for the disposition of the judgment money." (Indian Claims Commission statement—March 12, 1970.)

It should be pointed out that if the Indians are so anxious to repurchase alienated lands, why are they engaged in leasing tribal lands for 50-year periods for vacation homesites. The wish of the Indians to reacquire alienated lands, however admirable, is based on vague hopes and dreams.

The dissenting views state that the lakeshore does not meet the criteria for a national recreation area. They submit that the lakeshore is essentially comprised of 20 islands standing alone. The administration and the Park Service have stated the need for inclusion of the Indian lands as part of the mainland units. The Indians are adamant in their opposition to the lakeshore and expanding the boundaries can be accomplished only at the expense of the Indians. The Lakeshore unit, while only 10 $\frac{1}{4}$ miles long, is undeveloped shoreline, a rare resource and should be protected. Also, the lakeshore unit has spectacular geologic formations with beaches that can be enjoyed by the public. Also hiking, camping, and so forth.

The dissenting views state that the lakeshore does not meet the criteria of circular No. 1, establishing the Federal executive branch policy governing the selection, establishment, and administration of national recreation areas by the Recreation Advisory Council. National recreation areas should be strategically located within easy driving distance, not more than 250 miles from urban population centers—should have total population in excess of 30 million people—the criteria was adopted in March 1963. Improvements in highways and motor vehicles and the increase in urban affluence, interest in outdoor recreation and leisure time make a mockery of such outdated criteria. Northern Wisconsin has become an important summer recreation area for Illinois citizens, for example. About 50 million people live within a day's drive. Assistant Secretary of the Interior Glasgow, in a March 19, 1970, letter to ASPINALL, said:

The proposed Apostle Islands National Lakeshore has been found to satisfy the criteria for national recreation areas set forth in Policy Circular No. 1.

The Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments has endorsed the proposal.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I wanted to say to my colleague from Wisconsin that I had had some reservations relating to

this project, and I felt that probably the form of the bill as it passed the Senate was such as to be biting off more than we fairly should attempt to chew in light of some of the complaints that some of the Indians there had made. But it is my opinion that the House committee has very carefully considered this matter and has offered this bill to us in a form that ought to be supported. I certainly want to reiterate what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said. I hope there will be no amendments accepted in the House, and that our House conferees will stand fast, if it is necessary for this bill to go to conference, to keep the bill in exactly the form in which the House committee has recommended it.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I thank my colleague, and I join him in the wish that this bill not be amended, and, further, that this bill unamended be insisted upon by the House Members should it go to conference.

I will say further to the membership that this is a third generation of the bill relating to this proposal, the first two having been compromised to meet certain objections, particularly from Indians. The first bill included all the lands to which Mr. SAYLOR alluded as part of the park proposal. This was objected to last year, even though our Indian friends in Wisconsin have at various times in the recent past supported the Apostle Islands National Park, and as recently as last year the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, supported the bill.

Actually Indians in the area have had floats in local parades supporting the Apostle Islands National Park a few years ago. So the opposition alluded to is a recent point of view.

But to meet this objection a second generation of the bill was offered, a bill which made it optional for the Red Cliff Tribal Reservation areas that are held in trust to be optionally included upon application of the Red Cliff and Bad River bands and upon showing that the tribe supported inclusion of their lands.

Even this was objected to, the alternative of coming into the park, and so what your committee has done as a last resort to meet that objection is to eliminate inclusion of all of these lands completely. I refer to the lands in trust and in allotments which are actually owned by Indians today.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that after 40 years, Wisconsin, the upper Midwest, and the Nation will be rewarded by passage of the bill, in the form, I hope, recommended by our committee, that the House will adopt it, and the other body will agree to it.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, a short time ago the administration sent to the hill some recommended legislation dealing with Indians of the United States. The bills were subsequently introduced following the recommendations, and other bills which were somewhat different were introduced, all having the same noble objective: To give the American Indian

a greater share of the governing of his own affairs. When the bills in some form come to the floor, I suppose they will pass almost unanimously, if not unambiguously.

But on so many occasions when we have specific matters before us, where the Indians would like to have a little voice in what goes on, we say we will wait until next time. Maybe, as someone has suggested, part of what the Indians object to in this bill is because of a dream. Maybe that is true. They have had thoughts of reacquiring some of this land which is revered by the Indians. They hope they might do it with funds from pending dockets before the Indian Claims Commission. We have had loans for projects of this kind even from the Farmers' Home Administration. We have had special legislative actions to achieve just the purpose about which these Indians dream. So maybe part of it is a dream.

They also argue from logic, and they also argue from suspicion, and whether those suspicions can be founded or not, they certainly have reason to hold some suspicions.

Before I proceed in that, let me note that there is no question about where the Red Cliff Band of the Lake Superior Chippewa Indians stand on this legislation. The chairman of the Red Cliff Tribal Council, Albert Bressette, says this in a letter:

We, the people of the Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians wish to register our unalterable opposition.

Take this letter of September 9, 1970, from Loretta V. Ellis, Minneapolis Regional Vice President of the National Congress of American Indians, who says:

The National Congress of American Indians which I represent vehemently opposes this bill . . .

Let us get back to those suspicions for a minute. At one time the Indians owned all this land and all this area, but this is a history of what happened:

HISTORY OF BAD RIVER AND RED CLIFF RESERVATIONS

(By Benjamin Armstrong, adopted son of Chief Buffalo)

The following is taken from, *Early Life Among the Indians*.

In 1837, the government entered into a treaty with the Chippewas of the Mississippi and St. Croix rivers at St. Peter, Minnesota, with Colonel Snelling of the army, and Major Walker of Missouri, being the commissioners on the part of the government, and it appears that at the commencement of this council the anxiety on the part of the commissioners to perfect a treaty was so great that statements were made by them favorable to the Indians, and were understood perfectly by them, that were not afterwards incorporated in the treaty. The Indians were told by those commissioners that the Great Father had sent them to buy their pine timber and their minerals that were hidden in the earth, and that the Great Father was very anxious to dig their mineral, for of such material he made guns and knives for the Indians, and copper kettles in which to boil their sugar sap.

The timber you make but little use of is the pine your Great Father wants to build many steamboats, to bring your goods to you and to bring you to Washington bye and bye

to see your Great Father and meet him face to face. He does not want your lands, it is too cold up here for farming. He just wants enough of it to build towns where soldiers stop, mining camps for miners, saw mill sites and logging camps. The timber that is best for you the Great Father does not care about. The maple tree that you make your sugar from the birch tree that you get bark from for your canoes and from which you make palls for your sugar sap, the cedar from which you get material for making canoes, oars and paddles, your Great Father cares nothing for. It is the pine and minerals that he wants and he has sent us here to make a bargain with you for it, the commissioners said. And further, the Indians were told and distinctly understood that they were not to be disturbed in the possession of their lands so long as their men behaved themselves. They were told also that the Chippewas had always been good Indians and the Great Father thought very much of them on that account, and with these promises fairly and distinctly understood they signed the treaty that ceded to the government all their territory lying east of the Mississippi embracing the St. Croix district and east to the Chippewa river, but to my certain knowledge, the Indians never knew that they had ceded their lands until 1849, when they were asked to remove therefrom.

In 1842, Robert Stewart, on the part of the U.S. government, perfected a treaty at La Pointe, on Lake Superior, in which the Chippewas of the St. Croix and Superior country ceded all that portion of their territory, from the boundary of the former treaty of 1837, with the Chippewas of the Mississippi and St. Croix Indians, east and along the south shore of the Lake to the Chocolate river, Michigan territory. No conversation that was at this time gave the Indians an inkling or caused them to mistrust that they were ceding away their lands, but supposed that they were simply selling the pine and minerals, as they had in the treaty of 1837. When they were told, in 1849, to move on and thereby abandon their burying grounds—the dearest thing to an Indian—they began to hold councils and ask each other how they had understood the treaties and all understood them the same. That was: That they were never to be disturbed if they behaved themselves.

Messengers were sent to all the different bands in every part of their country to get the understanding of all the people and to inquire if any depredations had been committed by any of their young men, or what could be the reason for this sudden order to move. This was kept up for a year and no reason could be assigned by the Indians for the removal order.

In order to prevent trouble of a more serious nature, Chief Buffalo and Chief O-Shago, together with four other braves and Benjamin Armstrong decided to go to Washington to talk with President Fillmore. They left LaPointe on April 5, 1852, in a new birch bark canoe, called a four-fathom boat, 24 feet long with six paddles. The delegation was stopped at the "Soo" but after relating the seriousness of the situation they were allowed to proceed. The Indian agent again stopped them at Detroit and after several other difficulties they arrived in Washington on June 22, 1852.

Benjamin Armstrong set out to request an interview with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs which he decided to grant, and said, "I want you to take your Indians away on the next train west, as they have come here without permission, and I do not want to see you or hear of your Indians again."

Thus Armstrong was ordered out of the commissioner's office. Through the kindness of a Senator Briggs of New York and a member of President Fillmore's cabinet, they arranged an interview with the president.

A pipe brought by Buffalo especially for

this purpose was lit by him and then President Fillmore took a few draughts from it and smiling said, "Who is next?" at which Buffalo pointed out Senator Briggs and desired he should be next. The pipe was then passed to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Secretary of the Interior and several others, including the delegation of Indians.

In a brief speech after learning of the Indian situation in the northwest, the president said that he would countermand the removal order and that annuity payments would be made on LaPointe and he hoped in the future there would be no cause for complaint.

This eventually led to the treaty of 1854. Each chief selected sites for their various homes and all lands embraced within these boundaries should belong to the Indians; they were as follows: L'Anse Bay, Ontonagon, Lac du Flambeau, Court O'Milles, Bad River, Red Cliff, Fond du Lac, Minnesota, and one at Grand Portage, Minnesota.

Now I say there might be some suspicion. If you had been told for 2 or 3 or 4 years that we were going to authorize a park in your area, but it would never be implemented until we got all the Indian lands we wanted to put into the park, would you be suspicious? That is what we told the Indians. That is what we told the committee.

That was not simply this administration. The same statement was made by the last administration. Mr. Udall's department said this was not a viable area unless we would have the Indian lands. This was preached over and over again in the early days of this administration.

If you were an Indian sitting in Wisconsin, and you heard this over and over again, and you heard someone saying now we are going to set up this park here, but we need the Indian lands, would you be suspicious?

I do not enjoy this role of delaying this session today. We are not doing something unexpected. There were dissenting views on this bill. A rule was granted on the bill providing for 2 hours of general debate.

I do not believe the committee staff knew that the last three bills in this group were going to come up today themselves until the whip notice came out.

But that is beside the point. I can help to speed this proposition. When the time comes, I shall offer an amendment which will remove those lands which are in disagreement with the Indians.

Incidentally, I do have messages from Indians, from New York to Wisconsin to New Mexico, and to Alaska. I have talked with some of these people, and they certainly were not being led around by the nose by some white developer.

But, if that amendment is adopted we will have an Apostle Islands area of 20 islands, 39,000 acres, and will have given some respect to the Indians, whom all of us bleed for and speak for all of the time.

We can have an Apostle Islands area, and I hope we can get it, but I certainly believe it is time to say a word for the American Indian and to follow that word with some deed for the American Indian.

I yield back the remainder of my time. Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this legislation treats the Indians fairly. In

fact, I believe it should work to their economic advantage, as I hope to point out in statements I desire to make after the amendment is offered.

I am pleased to join with the chairman of the full committee and the ranking minority member and our colleague from Wisconsin in endorsing the legislation. It is needed, and in the years ahead this should be greatly appreciated by those who have an opportunity to enjoy it.

Mr. Chairman, House Resolution 9306 is one of the most difficult national park bills which we have considered in recent years. It was not difficult for us because of the nature of the area involved—for its national significance is unquestionable. But it was difficult because of the complicated land situation which confronted us.

The proposed Apostle Islands National Lakeshore is located in the State of Wisconsin. As recommended by the committee, it would include 20 islands scattered along the coastline of Lake Superior and a mainland unit with slightly more than 10 miles of frontage on the lake. Altogether, the lakeshore would comprise about 42,000 acres of land.

The recreation and natural values in this area are different, in some respects, than are those in the Gulf Islands area, but they are equally important. Here, instead of swimming and sunbathing—except for a few weeks each year—the recreation activities will include cold winter sports in the snow and on the ice. But boating, fishing, camping and hiking will be popular in the other seasons.

In making its recommendation, the committee substantially altered the original lakeshore boundaries because there are two Indian reservations in this region. Originally, the lakeshore included Indian lands from both of these reservations subject to their desires to be a part of it. Those who testified before our committee on behalf of the Indians indicated that they did not want to participate; therefore, the committee decided that they should be excluded.

There are no Indian trust lands included in this lakeshore to our knowledge, and section 2 of the bill expressly provides that no Indian trust lands are to be acquired for the lakeshore. The only exceptions to this blanket prohibition are two small lakefront tracts—totaling 27.33 acres and 57.27 acres—which the Secretary is authorized to purchase if a majority of the owners agree to sell. Other than those two small tracts, there are no Indian-owned lands which House Resolution 9306 authorizes to be acquired.

Most of the Members feel that they have gone as far as they reasonably could to protect the Indian interests. While the Indians are not satisfied, we are convinced that they have been treated fairly as far as their legitimate interests are concerned.

As recommended by the committee, the bill reduces the size of the lakeshore, Mr. Chairman, but we do not feel that we have destroyed its value as a national asset. In deleting the Indian lands, there was no feasible alternative but to reduce the size of the lakeshore—from 57,511

acres to the 41,966 acres. Naturally, the Park Service wants it all—just as any bureau would—but it has acknowledged that the smaller unit will be manageable. One result, of course, will be a reduced cost for acquisition and development. As is the usual practice, our bill limits land acquisition costs—\$4,250,000—and the development costs, \$5,000,000.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that some members of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation visited the area last year and conducted field hearings on the legislation. While the witnesses did not unanimously endorse this proposal, everyone had an opportunity to have his views heard and considered.

I am pleased to join the chairman of the full committee and my colleagues from Wisconsin in endorsing this legislation. It is sound and it is equitable. In the years ahead, this area will be greatly appreciated by those who have an opportunity to enjoy it. I recommend the enactment of H.R. 9306, as amended.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. O'KONSKI).

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this measure.

First I want to thank the chairman of the committee, the chairman of the subcommittee, my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER), my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR), and all the other members of the committee for being so fair and so considerate and so compromising in arriving at a viable, working bill, after 40 years of dreams about this project.

This project first evolved under similar circumstances, when we had a Republican President, a Republican Cabinet member as Secretary of the Interior, and a Democratic House and a Democratic Senate. It was similar to the situation we have now. We have gone the full circle 40 years later.

After compromising, I believe that this committee has done the fairest and most admirable job of arriving at a workable and viable bill so that finally we can achieve the dream which was dreamed 40 years ago.

Let me give just a little bit as to the assets of this area.

From the standpoint of natural beauty, this area has no equal in our land.

From the standpoint of geology and geological interests, there is no area in our Nation comparable to that which exists in the Apostle Islands area.

From the standpoint of history, it has a value similar to the value of the East. The fact of the matter is that this area was settled by French missionaries and furriers at the time when the Pilgrims were landing on Plymouth Rock.

That is how historically valuable this area is. It is more than 1,000 miles inland from the New England coast. It is as old in history as the east coast. Something was said about not being fair to the Indians. No one is more concerned about Indian welfare than I am. I might say in passing that I happen to be an

honorary chief of the Chippewa Tribe of the Bad River Reservation, the telegrams some of which have been read over here. I have been an honorary chief of their tribe for the past 20 years. I should think if there were any real grassroots opposition to this lakeshore park that these Indians would have some communication with me. I have had none in opposition to this bill. The fact of the matter is that I have held office hours on August 17 at Ashland, Wis., just 6 miles from the Bad River Reservation, and not more than 15 miles from the Red Cliff Reservation, and among the things I announced in holding these office hours was that I would like to get the impression of the people of the area toward the formation of this lakeshore national park called the Apostle Islands and that I would like to meet with any interested groups in opposition to or in favor of this proposal. Not one single individual met with me opposed to this project. Twelve Indians, 10 from the Bad River Reservation and two from the Red Cliff Reservation queried me about where all of this opposition by the Indians comes from. They said:

We hear of none on our reservation. We have had no public meetings discussing this bill or in opposition to it.

So, they could not understand why they were being quoted as saying that the Indians of the reservation were opposed to this bill.

Now, I venture to say that this sheaf of telegrams that my good and conscientious colleague from the State of Iowa has is from people who never read the bill, that is, the people who wrote those telegrams and who sent them never even read the compromise version of the bill. I doubt whether those people who sent those telegrams are aware of the fact that this bill has been compromised to the point where there is not one single solitary acre of Indian land involved in this bill. I am positive, if I might use Indian parlance, being an honorary Indian chief, that behind these telegrams there is more smoke than fire. I am positive that that is the situation. If it were not for the opposition by people who have a selfish interest, by people who are private owners of the property, I am positive that many of these telegrams would never have arrived in the Nation's Capital. In other words, I am again concerned about the welfare of the Indians but I am afraid that the Indians are being used and I resent the Indians being used just as much as my good colleague from Iowa does.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I mentioned the gentleman's name and I yield to him.

Mr. KYL. Is the gentleman in the well familiar with the referendum which was held on the reservation?

Mr. O'KONSKI. On the reservation. Yes, I am very well acquainted with it. I might mention that I do not think the chief who sent you the telegram is any longer the chief. They recently changed chiefs. You have to have communication with him.

Mr. KYL. I cannot speak to that point

because the most recent communication I have from him is not within the last week or two, but the referendum which was held by the Indians did indeed show that they were opposed, did it not?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Well, I think that if there was grassroots opposition to this, when I was holding these meetings within the immediate accessible area, and I spent 6 hours waiting for them, I think if there was any real organized grassroots opposition to the bill, that these Indians on the reservation, particularly when I told them my announcement that among the first order of business when we got back to Washington was going to be the consideration by the House of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore Park bill—I am sure that they would have made it known to me.

I am positive that if there were grassroots opposition to the bill that the chiefs and the members of the tribes would have been over there to see me, particularly from the Odanah Reservation, since I am one of their honorary chiefs.

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

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I think we must be fair about this proposition now, when we dismiss some of these telegrams because the Indians who sent them may not have read the bill. I think that is a little bit unfair because, as a matter of fact, I think the gentleman from Wisconsin will have to agree with me that when we vote on this bill a very small percentage of the Members of this House will have read this bill; is that correct?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Well, in some form or other, yes.

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say this in closing: that for 40 years this area in northern Wisconsin has been in a state of limbo. Forty years ago it was suggested that this area be set aside for a national park, a national lakeshore park. So for 40 years we have had no economic development, and no private development in that area, because any time anyone wanted to come over there to develop the area privately or economically, the prospective developer always was told that the people of Chicago—and incidentally we no longer can think of land in the United States of America in terms of provincialism. No matter where the land is, it has to be thought of in terms of the national interest. The people of Chicago, the people of Detroit, the people of Milwaukee, the people of Minneapolis-St. Paul, the people of St. Louis, the people of Indianapolis who come over there are all unanimously of the opinion that this area should be set aside as a national park. And because that has been in the making for the past 40 years no private developer would ever come in there and develop the area, and hence we are at an economic standstill. And, as I say, for the past 40 years we have been in that state of limbo, of economic standstill because the idea of a national park is so entrenched among the people within a radius of 500 miles of that area that

they can think of that area in no other terms.

If you really want to help the Indians of that area I urge you to vote for this bill, because I see in this bill the making and the creation of jobs—jobs for Indians. And incidentally these 12 Indians who came over to see me, their main concern was getting jobs in the area and getting an economic development in the area.

This project will make jobs in the area, it will make jobs for the Indians. If you are really concerned about the welfare of the Indians of that area I plead with you and I beg you to vote for the passage of this bill as it is.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the legislation before the House to establish the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore, I wish to point out to my colleagues and to future visitors that this area is one of the most significant in our Nation's history, both geologically and historically.

As an adopted member of the Bad River Band of Chippewa Indians at Odanah, given the name of Gigidoweinnay—Chief Man of the Council—I am interested in having this bill represent the intent of Congress and to honor my Chippewa brothers. Although the two reservations in the area are not included unless they later request it, I personally hope and feel that a monument should be erected and dedicated to the Chippewa Indians, to be erected at their one-time capital city at La Pointe on Madeline Island. Madeline Island, the largest of the Apostle Islands, is also not included in the legislation, but I am sure that future visitors will want to see Madeline and learn more of its past history.

It is thought that the Lake Superior region is the oldest of the known world and was the first to emerge from a global ocean. Because of its age and the violent eruptions to which the area has been subjected, it provides a rich source of geological study. It is in this area that the Apostle Islands are located.

Nelson Ross, in his informative book—"La Pointe—Village Outpost"—writes as follows:

There is a village in Northernmost Wisconsin, little known today, which has experienced periods of prosperity, years of fame and decades of somnolence. La Pointe was the home of the Ojibway. It was the haven of safety for that tribe and for subsequent posts of the French and English fur trader, from the hostile attacks of the Sioux and other Indians. Here were planted the seeds of both the Roman Catholic and Protestant religions when the Northwest was unknown country.

It is possible that the La Pointe area was being explored when the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock. Its development, one thousand miles inland, under the French regime, came at the same time as that of the English thirteen colonies on the Atlantic seaboard. In the La Pointe region a church was founded the year after the English took Manhattan from the Dutch, and the village was a thriving settlement when George Washington was born.

To the French, who were the first white arrivals, the terms La Pointe and Chequamogon (She-wam-egun) were practically synonymous, although the latter was the first known and older name.

The Apostle Islands, sometimes called the Enchanted Isles of Keche-Gamme, are clustered about the Bayfield Peninsula, which is the northernmost mainland of Wisconsin. They occupy an area of about 600 square miles in Lake Superior and comprise about 77 square miles of land area. Although named the Twelve Apostles by the early missionaries, there are actually 23 islands ranging in size from a fraction of an acre to the largest, Madeline, with an area of about 14,000 acres.

The Chequamegon Bay and Apostle Island area is rich in Indian lore and history. It is believed that the Chippewa or Ojibway Indians left their former home on the Gulf of St. Lawrence and arrived in the Chequamegon region about 1490, 2 years before the Columbus discovery of America. According to tribal legends, they were following the great white shell, Megis, which gave warmth and light to the tribe. The first Chippewa settlement in Wisconsin is said to have been at La Pointe, on Chequamegon Bay, where they found plentiful food, fish, and wild rice. Sister M. Carolissa Levy in her book, "Chippewa Indians of Yesterday and Today," says:

This village of La Pointe greatly antedated other early Wisconsin settlements, such as Ashland and Superior and La Pointe was old before these cities were even dreamed of by white men . . . La Pointe on the Chequamegon passed into oblivion when the Sioux declared war upon the Chippewa tribes living in that area, but a greater La Pointe arose some years later on the Apostle Islands.

The Chippewas made their settlement on Madeline Island, first named St. Michel's Island by the French priests. The Chippewa named this island "Moning-wunakauning"—"The Home of the Golden Breasted Woodpecker" from the thousands of birds which used it in their yearly migrations. Here they lived and made it their principal home until about the time the Pilgrims were landing on Plymouth Rock in 1620.

It is a commonly accepted fact that the first white man to see the islands, was the French explorer Etienne Brule. The trips of Brule and a number of subsequent explorers were motivated by the French desire to open the mythical "Northwest Passage to China and the East Indies." A trip of real historical significance was made by French explorers and fur traders, Radisson and Grosseillers in 1659. They left Montreal and spent the winter at the foot of the Chequamegon Bay, near the present city of Ashland, where they built a cabin, probably the first white man's house on the entire lake.

The next visit was under the leadership of Father Rene Menard, a Jesuit priest, who established a trading post with a band of fur traders. Father Menard died soon, but another Jesuit, Father Claude Alluex, came in 1665 to establish a mission, located between Ashland and Washburn, for the conversion of the Indians. He was followed by Father Jacques Marquette, both of whom had little success with the Indians' religious beliefs.

France, in 1671, formally took possession of the Great Lakes country and sent their envoys to negotiate with the Indian tribes engaged in fur trading. The envoys asked for permission to trade and promised the Indians the protection of the great French nation against all enemies. The Indians readily accepted the proposals of peace, protection and mutual support and from that day, the Chippewas called the French king "Father" and their lands were opened to French enterprise.

In 1678, the French Governor, Frontenac, encouraged Daniel Greysolon and Sieur Dulhut, in fitting out an expedition for Lake Superior to investigate the rich copper deposits which were associated with the Lake Superior country.

In 1693, Pierre Le Sueur, an adventurous forest trader, was sent by the French to keep open the trade route. Accompanied by a small band of soldiers and fur traders, he built the first stockaded fort on what was then called St. Michel's Island at La Pointe. About this time, the Chippewa Indians returned to the island and settled at La Pointe. Here, the new village became the seat of the Chippewa empire and the official headquarters for 12,000 Indians whose domain extended from Michigan westward to Lake Itasca and from Canada, southward to Shell Lake, Wis.

French fur traders continued to occupy Madeline Island until 1763, the close of the French and Indian War. However, because the earlier French traders on the lake shipped such a large volume of furs, the market prices declined to ruinous levels and the King of France, Louis XIV, prohibited further trading for 20 years. A succession of French commanders reestablished the fur trade and continued to occupy the island until New France fell to England.

The British now took over the fur-trading industry under the leadership of Alexander Henry, a resident of the colony of New Jersey. He took as his partner, Jean Baptiste Cadotte, the son of a French officer. Jean married an Indian woman and they had two sons, John Baptiste and Michel, both of whom were educated in Montreal. Michel took up the fur trading business and in 1785 returned to Madeline Island, where he married an Indian princess, who was renamed Madeline when she was baptized. Her father was so pleased with the marriage that he renamed the island Madeline, in honor of his daughter.

Madeline Island and the Village of La Pointe now became a thriving settlement when John Jacob Astor's American Fur Co. took over the fur industry. The fortunes of the area now fluctuated with the successes or failures of the fur industry, the copper, fishing, and lumbering industry and with periods of boom and panic experienced in the general economy of the American Government.

Today, although the area is no longer the capital of the Chippewa Indian Nation and the fur trading industry, its geological foundations, its startling beauty, and its historical importance

make it an area of outstanding significance.

Madeline Island is truly billed the "Island of Antiquity"—Under four flags: Spain, 1512-1627; France, 1627 to 1762; England, 1763 to 1783, and the United States of America from 1783 to the present.

We find pages from the past today in the names of residents and villages and cities of the area; residents such as the Souliers, Bresettes, Lemieux, Royces, Gordons, Dupuis and others; villages, cities, and rivers such as Cadott, Radisson, Solon Springs, from the French explorer, Greysolon; Duluth, from Sieur Dulhut; and Brule and the Brule River.

A brochure from the Madeline Island Historical Museum at La Pointe, lists the highlights of the past of this historical area. I am now putting this commentary in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The listing follows:

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE PAST

It is possible that Etienne Brule came to the region as early as 1618—two years before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock. The French trading post, located on the nearby bay was a thriving settlement when George Washington was born, and the American Fur Company's factory, under John Jacob Astor, was exploiting the region when Abraham Lincoln was a young man.

Some of the highlights of past history are as follows:

1659—Pierre Esprit Radisson and Medart Chouart, Sieur des Grosseillers came to Chequamegon Bay and traded with the Indians.

1661—Father Rene Menard, a Jesuit priest, came but lost his life on an errand of mercy.

1665—Father Claude Jean Allouez, another Jesuit, came and spent three years endeavoring to convert the natives to Christianity.

1669—Father Jacques Marquette followed Allouez but was forced to leave in 1670 due to the hostility of the Sioux Indians.

1679—Daniel Greysolon, Sieur Dulhut (later known as Duluth) spent the winter on Chequamegon Bay, and in the spring of 1680 discovered and traveled over the Brule-St. Croix route to the Mississippi.

1693—Pierre Le Sueur founded a trading post on the south end (modern Grant's Point) of Madeline Island.

1718—Paul le Gardeur, Sieur de St. Pierre, built a French post near the present Old Mission, and this survived until 1763 when the French were conquered by the English.

1793—Michel Cadotte founded a trading post for the (British) North West Company on the south end of the island, not far from Le Sueur's site of one hundred years before.

1816—This post was taken over by the American Fur Company which, after moving to present La Pointe in 1835, finally failed in 1845. From this time, the village gradually faded in importance until about 1895 when the locality gained prominence as a summer retreat.

As an interesting background, here is a brief description of the 23 islands comprising the Apostle Islands:

LONG ISLAND

Originally this was part of Chequamegon Point and did not become an island until about 1821. Therefore the early French and Indian names were applied to the entire peninsula. Indian name: Shagewomokong—"Soft Beaver Dam." Width: from 100 feet to ¼ mile. Acreage: about 325.

There is a lighthouse situated on the north side of the island about 1¼ miles from its west end. It is equipped with a fog horn, radio direction apparatus and radio tele-

phone. A smaller range light is located on the extreme west end, and this has a fog bell in conjunction. The island is a long and narrow sand spit with a growth of stunted pine. In years past it supported a profusion of blueberries, but these have died out to a considerable extent.

MADELINE ISLAND

Indian name: Moningwunakauning Miniss—"The Island of the Golden Breasted Woodpecker." (Miniss is the Ojibway for Island.) French names: Isle Detour, La Ronde, Montreal, St. Michael's, La Pointe, St. Esprit, Michel.

English names: Cadotte, Woodpecker, Yellow Hammer, Middle, La Pointe, Magdaline, Madeleine, Madelaine, Michael.

Length: 12½ miles. Width: varying from 1½ miles at the middle waist to 3½ miles. Acreage: about 13,168.

This is the only island with a permanent settlement and a system of roads. The fixed population is about 175, but this is increased during the summer months to about 500. There is one inn open in the summer only, the Chateau Madeleine. The village has a grade school and two churches, a Roman Catholic, and an Evangelical and Reformed Protestant. There are also three stores and a post office.

The island supports a number of farms, one or two of which have been fairly prosperous. The others, for the most part, might be classified as subsistence farms only. The short growing season and the glacial boulder drift are not conducive to large crops save where there has been a deep accumulation of forest humus. Aside from the summer tourist and resident trade, the economy of the island largely depends upon fishing. The fishermen inhabit the east side of the island where they are near the fishing grounds and reefs of the lake.

The island has been logged thoroughly, and all that remains of virgin timber is found at the northeast point where the treaty of 1854 reserved about 100 acres as a base from which the Indians might fish. A few isolated trees which the loggers missed appear here and there. The rest of the island is covered with second growth evergreen, and a preponderance of birch, oak, maple and poplar. On the southeast side and northeast end are a number of caves and arches which the waves have worn in the sandstone.

MICHIGAN ISLAND

Indian name: Bugadabi Miniss—"Hook and Line Island." Length: 3½ miles. Width: 1¼ miles at the south end, tapering to a point at the northeast. Acreage: about 1,296.

At the southeastern end are old and new lighthouses; the old one is a picturesque brick and masonry structure with the light keepers' quarters attached, the new one is of steel tubular construction, about forty feet higher than the old, and its light is about 170 feet above the lake. The light is now operated automatically, and keepers no longer live on the island.

CAT ISLAND

Indian name: Kagagiwanjikag Miniss—"Island of Hemlock Trees." Local name: Hemlock. Other name: Shoe. Length: 3 miles. Width: 1¼ miles at its south end. Acreage: about 1,920.

The outline of the island is not unlike that of a cat, and one early observer likened it to a shoe. These similes account for two of the names. The official and local names are often garbled into a single "Catterhemlock." There is a sand point at the south end with fairly long beaches. A few wave-washed rock formations appear at the north end.

OTTER ISLAND

Indian name: Nigig Miniss—"Otter Island." Former name: Alabama. Local name: Hardwood. Length: 2 miles. Width 1¼ miles. Acreage: about 963.

While there may have been otter in enough numbers to warrant the Indian name, it is extremely doubtful if there are any on this island today. There is a small sand beach on the southeast side, the site of an old logging camp. The island averages about forty feet in height, and there are interesting rock formations at the north end.

ROCKY ISLAND

Indian name: Sinsibakwado Miniss—"Maple Sugar Island." Local name: Rice's. Length: main part, 2 miles. A narrow neck extends from the main portion in a northeasterly direction for 1½ miles. Width: main part, 1 mile. Acreage: about 751.

The east side is principally sand beach, with a sand point at the south. Along the east side is an excellent harbor for small boats. This feature has been capitalized by owners of a small resort which caters to the summer troller. The resort lies close to the most popular trolling waters. Two small settlements of fishermen have been located on this side for fifty years or more. The local name stems from one of the founders of the City of Bayfield, Henry M. Rice, who at one time owned all of the stumpage on the island.

SOUTH TWIN ISLAND

Indian name: Wabaso Miniss—"Rabbit Island." Local name: Willey's. Former name: Shoal. Length: 1 mile. Width: ¾ mile. Roughly an oval in shape. Acreage: about 350.

Aside from Long Island this is the only one in the group which shows no rock outcroppings. On the west side a short sand spit reaches toward Rocky Island. An abandoned fish camp also lies on the west side.

NORTH TWIN ISLAND

Indian name: Miskwassikag Miniss—"Red Stone Island." Local name: Brownstone. Former name: Cat. Length: 1 mile. Width: about ¼ mile at the center and tapering to points at each end. Acreage: about 158.

The island is practically all rock except for a small clay bank at the northeast corner. A small summer cottage is located at its northwest corner. Exceptionally good trolling waters lie off the north end at a distance of about two miles.

RASPBERRY ISLAND

Indian name: Miskominikan Miniss—"Island of Raspberries." Former name: Cranberry. Length: about 1 mile over its irregular shape. Width: about ½ mile. Acreage: about 293.

There is an excellent sand beach at the southeast point. There is a lighthouse on the south side equipped with a fog bell, both of which are operated entirely automatically, with no keepers in attendance.

BEAR ISLAND

Indian name: Mako Miniss—"Bear Island." Length: 2 miles. Width: 1¾ miles. Acreage: about 1,590.

While called Bear, the charts show an island shaped like a turtle, with head and forefeet to the north, and tail toward the south. Viewed from the water it has the silhouette of a whale. At the southeast point there is a long sand spit with excellent beaches. A fish camp has been located here for many years. There are picturesque rock formations on the east and north sides.

DEVIL'S ISLAND

Indian name: Matchimantou Miniss—"Evil Spirit Island." Former names: Brownstone, Rabbit, Barney & Lamborn's. Length: 1¼ miles. Width: ½ mile. Acreage: about 318.

This is the northernmost body of land in Wisconsin, and is one of the most unusual islands in the group. Some of the deepest and most extensive cave formations on Lake Superior are found at its northern end. The entire island is owned by the Federal Government. An important lighthouse with a fog

horn, radio direction apparatus and radio telephone is located at the north end. The keeper's small gasoline boat is kept at the south end, in the protection of a massive dock. The island supports a low ground growth, rather stunted trees and an abundance of very large blueberries.

SAND ISLAND

Indian name: Wababiko Miniss—"White Rock Island." Length and Width: about 2 miles, with a narrow neck about 1 mile long extending northward from the northeast corner. Acreage: about 2,900.

One of the phenomena of this island is the shoal connecting it with the mainland two miles away. This is entirely of sand, and geologists believe that it will eventually make a peninsula of the island. Soundings average about six feet in depth the entire distance. Those taken in 1823 showed depths of from 46 to 50 feet. The latter were made by Lieutenant Henry Bayfield, after whom the City and County of Bayfield were named.

At the north end of the projecting neck there is an automatic lighthouse. There are two fish camps on the east side, and at one time there was a small summer resort located at the southeast corner. Around the northwest corner are rather extensive cave formations.

EAGLE ISLAND

Indian name: Nabikwana Miniss—"Boat Island." Local name: Steamboat. Length and Width: barely ½ mile. Acreage: about 25.

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

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, after the profound and moving address of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. O'KONSKI), there is little that anyone can add.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the approval of this legislation—after so many years—reflects great credit on the many who have worked long and hard for this legislation.

Particular credit must be accorded to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER).

This legislation ran the grave danger of being shunted aside this Congress—as it had been in the past. Due to the tireless persistence of BOB KASTENMEIER, who patiently met objection after objection posed by our colleagues, this noble project is now on the threshold of reality.

Future generations will owe a debt to many—but most of all to our effective colleague, Congressman KASTENMEIER.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to conserve and develop for the benefit, inspiration, education, recreational use, and enjoyment of the public certain significant islands and shoreline of the United States and their related geographic, scenic, and scientific values, there is hereby established the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore (hereinafter referred to as the "Lakeshore") in Ashland and Bayfield Counties, Wisconsin, consisting of the area generally depicted

on the map entitled "Apostle Islands National Lakeshore", numbered NL-AI-91,000, sheets 1 and 2, and dated June 1970. The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

SEC. 2. No lands held in trust by the United States for either the Red Cliff Band or Bad River Band of the Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, or for allottees thereof, shall be acquired or included within the boundaries of the lakeshore established by this Act, with the following exception:

If the Indians who own more than 50 per centum of the interest in allotment number 74 GL or allotment number 135 in the Red Cliff Reservation agree to sell the allotment to the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), the Secretary may consent to the sale on behalf of the other owners, purchase the allotment for the negotiated price and revise the boundaries of the lakeshore to include the allotment.

SEC. 3. The Secretary may acquire within the boundaries of the lakeshore lands and interests therein by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange, but lands and interests in lands owned by the State of Wisconsin may be acquired only by donation. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Federal property located within the boundaries of the lakeshore may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without transfer of funds to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for the purposes of the lakeshore.

SEC. 4. (a) With the exception of not more than eighty acres of land to be designated within the lakeshore boundaries by the Secretary as an administrative site, visitor center, and related facilities, as soon as practicable, any owner or owners of improved property on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition of such acquisition, retain for themselves and their successors or assigns a right of use and occupancy of the improved property for noncommercial residential purposes for a definite term not to exceed twenty-five years, or, in lieu thereof, for a term ending at the death of the owner, or the death of his spouse, whichever is the later. The owner shall elect the term to be reserved. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the fair market value of the property on the date of such acquisition less the fair market value on such date of the right retained by the owner.

(b) A right of use and occupancy retained pursuant to this section may be terminated with respect to the entire property by the Secretary upon his determination that the property or any portion thereof has ceased to be used for noncommercial residential or for agricultural purposes, and upon tender to the holder of a right an amount equal to the fair market value, as of the date of the tender, of that portion of the right which remains unexpired on the date of termination.

(c) The term "improved property", as used in this section, shall mean a detached, noncommercial residential dwelling, the construction of which was begun before January 1, 1967 (hereinafter referred to as "dwelling"), together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated, the said land being in the same ownership as the dwelling, as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use, together with any structures accessory to the dwelling which are situated on the land so designated.

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall permit hunting, fishing, and trapping on lands and waters under his jurisdiction within the boundaries of the lakeshore in accordance with the appropriate laws of Wisconsin and the United States to the extent applicable, except that

he may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting, trapping, or fishing shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, fish or wildlife management, or public use and enjoyment. Except in emergencies, any regulations prescribing any such restrictions shall be put into effect only after consultation with the appropriate State agency responsible for hunting, trapping, and fishing activities.

SEC. 6. The lakeshore shall be administered, protected, and developed in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1, 2-4), as amended and supplemented; and the Act of April 9, 1924 (43 Stat. 90; 16 U.S.C. 8a et seq.), as amended, except that any other statutory authority available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resources may be utilized to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of the Act.

SEC. 7. In the administration, protection, and development of the lakeshore, the Secretary shall adopt and implement, and may from time to time revise, a land and water use management plan which shall include specific provision for—

(a) protection of scenic, scientific, historic, geological, and archeological features contributing to public education, inspiration, and enjoyment;

(b) development of facilities to provide the benefits of public recreation together with such access roads as he deems appropriate; and

(c) preservation of the unique flora and fauna and the physiographic and geologic conditions now prevailing on the Apostle Islands within the lakeshore: *Provided*, That the Secretary may provide for the public enjoyment and understanding of the unique natural, historical, scientific, and archeological features of the Apostle Islands through the establishment of such trails, observation points, exhibits, and services as he may deem desirable.

SEC. 8. There are authorized to be appropriated not more than \$4,250,000 for the acquisition of lands and interests in lands and not more than \$5,000,000 for the development of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KYL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KYL: Page 12, line 10, strike out all of Section 1 and insert in lieu thereof:

"That in order to conserve and develop for the benefit, inspiration, education, recreation, use, and enjoyment of the public certain significant islands of the United States and their related geographic, scenic, and scientific values, there is hereby established the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore (hereinafter referred to as the 'lakeshore') in Ashland and Bayfield Counties, Wisconsin, consisting of the area generally depicted on the map entitled 'Apostle Islands National Lakeshore', numbered NL-AI-91,000, sheet 1, and dated June 1970. The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior."

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does one thing along with a couple of perfecting devices, to accomplish that single purpose. It would create a national

seashore as would the original legislation, but that seashore would comprise 20 islands, all of the islands included in the bill which has been brought to the floor today. It would not include—and this is the difference—it would not include those mainland areas described in the bill that we are debating.

This amendment, in short, then would provide a significant park area—a significant lakeshore area—because this is not a national park but a lakeshore area. But it would also do so without violating the desires of the Indian groups who have lived in this area since long before the white man came.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Originally, the lakeshore area proposal provided for the inclusion of a considerable amount of Indian-owned lands provided the Indians elected to participate.

While the Indians at one time seemed to favor the proposal, they later became hostile to it. For this reason, the bill was amended while it was being considered in committee to take out more than 15,000 acres of Indian-owned land.

As a matter of fact, we took out all of the Indian-owned land except two parcels which I will mention in a minute.

The boundaries of the lakeshore were redrawn by the committee to exclude all Indian-owned lands except the bill does provide that two specified parcels of Indian-allotted lands which are located on the lakefront may be purchased by the Secretary if—and only if—a majority of the owners agree to the sale. These two parcels contain about 84 acres, and belong to numerous owners scattered in various parts of the Nation. These tracts are barren, unimproved, uncultivated, unproductive, and are not supporting one single Indian.

The area does include 1,541 acres of land lying within the original boundary of the Red Cliff Indian Reservation, but this is land that has been alienated by the Indians—that is, it has been sold to white purchasers with the approval of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. The Indians have not taken any action to indicate that they have any plans to reacquire this land.

These Indians now say, "Do not create a part on this land because we may some day want to buy the land back." In my opinion, that is going too far.

I believe that Indian hostility has been encouraged to a great extent by white property owners for whom the Indians work.

During the field hearings in Wisconsin, I asked one Indian who was opposing the bill as a witness if he would oppose the lakeshore area if all the Indian-owned land were removed from the area. And he said, "Yes." I say, "Why?" He said, "We must protect our white brothers."

I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Wisconsin that these Indians are being used for selfish purposes. I am a member of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee and am as anxious as any Member of the House to see that the Indians are properly protected. But I believe in dealing with this bill we have gone as far as we

can and as far as reasonable in protecting their rights. As a matter of fact, I believe that in creating this park we will work a great economic advantage to the Indians. In my district of North Carolina we have the Cherokee Indian Reservation. It is located adjacent to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. I am proud to be an honorary chief in that reservation. This park has caused the construction of more than a dozen fine motels on the Indian reservation. It has established restaurants, filling stations, craft shops, and other Indian-owned businesses.

It has established a market for crafts which many Indians work on during the entire year. It has accomplished wonders in raising the standard of living and providing employment for the Cherokee Indians.

I believe the Apostle Islands Lakeshore should provide some of the same results for the Red Cliff Indians and the Bad River Indians, whose reservation is next door.

Just one more statement: If and when this bill goes to conference we will insist and demand that the House language protecting the Indians be retained.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask that it and all other amendments being offered, which will eliminate the Lakeshore Drive, be defeated.

Very frankly, I personally would have liked to have brought to the floor the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore as recommended by the Department of the Interior. That lakeshore would have had the Apostle Islands unit, the Red Cliff unit, and the Kakagon-Bad River slough unit. It would have comprised 55,787 acres of land, 33,050 acres of water and a 30 mile scenic shoreline drive. This would have provided a really viable unit to our national park system, and I think would have been a benefit to all the country, as well as all the Indians. I predict that when the House today passes this bill, within a matter of years the present Wisconsin Indian leadership that is opposing the establishment of this national lakeshore will come to their Representatives in both the House and the Senate and ask that this Apostle Islands National Lakeshore be expanded to include the project as it was originally proposed by the Department of the Interior.

I therefore ask that the amendment be defeated and that the bill as reported pass.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments? If not, the question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, 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. 9306) to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1186, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. KYL

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KYL. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion to recommit. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KYL moves to recommit the bill H.R. 9306 to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment: Page 12, line 10, strike out all of section 1 and insert in lieu thereof:

"That in order to conserve and develop for the benefit, inspiration, education, recreational use, and enjoyment of the public, certain significant islands of the United States and their related geographic, scenic, and scientific values, there is hereby established the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore (hereinafter referred to as the 'lakeshore') in Ashland and Bayfield Counties, Wisconsin, consisting of the area generally depicted on the map entitled 'Apostle Islands National Lakeshore', numbered NL-AI-91,000, sheet 1, and dated June 1970. The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 29, nays 199, answered "present" 1, not voting 200, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]
YEAS—29

Bennett	Hunt	Rarick
Blester	Kyl	Reid, Ill.
Clausen,	Latta	Robison
Don H.	Lloyd	Schmitz
Devine	McClure	Scott
Dickinson	McEwen	Stanton
Goodling	McKneally	Steiger, Ariz.
Gross	Minshall	Wylie
Grover	Montgomery	Wyman
Hogan	Randall	Zwach

NAYS—199

Abbutt	Frelinghuysen	Myers
Abernethy	Fulton, Pa.	Natcher
Adair	Gallfianakis	Nichols
Adams	Gallagher	O'Neil
Albert	Gavdos	O'Hara
Anderson, Ill.	Gettys	O'Konski
Andrews, Ala.	Gibbons	Olsen
Andrews,	Gonzalez	Passman
N. Dak.	Gray	Patten
Arends	Green, Oreg.	Perkins
Ashley	Green, Pa.	Pettis
Aspinall	Griffin	Pike
Belcher	Griffiths	Poage
Betts	Gubser	Poff
Bevill	Gude	Pollock
Blaggi	Halpern	Preyer, N.C.
Blanton	Hamilton	Price, Ill.
Bolling	Hammer-	Pucinski
Bow	schmidt	Rallsback
Brinkley	Hansen, Idaho	Reid, N.Y.
Brooks	Harrington	Reuss
Brotzman	Hastings	Rhodes
Brown, Mich.	Hathaway	Rodino
Broyhill, N.C.	Hechler, W. Va.	Roe
Broyhill, Va.	Heckler, Mass.	Rogers, Fla.
Burke, Mass.	Helstoski	Rosenthal
Burlison, Mo.	Henderson	Rostenkowski
Burton, Calif.	Horton	Roth
Byrne, Pa.	Hosmer	Roybal
Caffery	Hull	Ruth
Carey	Hungate	Ryan
Carter	Ichord	Satterfield
Cederberg	Jarman	Saylor
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	Schadeberg
Chappell	Johnson, Pa.	Scheuer
Clawson, Del.	Jones, N.C.	Shipley
Cleveland	Kastenmeyer	Shriver
Cohelan	Kazen	Sikes
Collier	Kee	Slack
Collins	Kleppe	Smith, Calif.
Colmer	Kyros	Smith, N.Y.
Conable	Landgrebe	Springer
Conyers	Long, Md.	Stafford
Culver	McClory	Staggers
Daniel, Va.	McCloskey	Steed
Daniels, N.J.	McDade	Steiger, Wis.
Davis, Wis.	McDonald,	Stratton
Dellenback	Mich.	Sullivan
Dennis	McFall	Taylor
Derwinski	Madden	Thomson, Wis.
Donohue	Mahon	Tierman
Downing	Mailliard	Udall
Dulski	Mann	Ullman
Duncan	Marsh	Van Deerlin
Dwyer	Martin	Vanik
Eckhardt	Mathias	Vigorito
Edmondson	Matsunaga	Waggonner
Edwards, Calif.	May	Walde
Erlenborn	Meeds	Wampler
Eshleman	Michel	Watts
Fascell	Mikva	Whalley
Fisher	Miller, Ohio	Whitehurst
Flood	Mills	Williams
Flowers	Minish	Winn
Foley	Mizell	Wolf
Ford, Gerald R.	Moorhead	Wright
Ford,	Moss	Zablocki
William D.	Murphy, Ill.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Haley

NOT VOTING—200

Addabbo	Bush	Edwards, Ala.
Alexander	Button	Edwards, La.
Anderson,	Byrnes, Wis.	Eilberg
Calif.	Cabell	Esch
Anderson,	Camp	Evans, Colo.
Tenn.	Casey	Evins, Tenn.
Annunzio	Celler	Fallon
Ashbrook	Chisholm	Farbstein
Ayres	Clancy	Feighan
Baring	Clark	Findley
Barrett	Clay	Fish
Beall, Md.	Conte	Flynt
Bell, Calif.	Corbett	Foreman
Berry	Corman	Fountain
Bingham	Coughlin	Fraser
Blackburn	Cowger	Frey
Blatnik	Cramer	Friedel
Boggs	Crane	Fulton, Tenn.
Boland	Cunningham	Fuqua
Brademas	Daddario	Garmatz
Brasco	Davis, Ga.	Gialmo
Bray	Dawson	Gilbert
Brock	de la Garza	Goldwater
Broomfield	Delaney	Hagan
Brown, Calif.	Denney	Hall
Brown, Ohio	Dent	Hanley
Buchanan	Diggs	Hanna
Burke, Fla.	Dingell	Hansen, Wash.
Burleson, Tex.	Dorn	Harsha
Burton, Utah	Dowdy	Harvey

Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hicks
Holfield
Howard
Hutchinson
Jacobs
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Keith
King
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Landrum
Langen
Leggett
Lennon
Long, La.
Lowenstein
Lujan
Lukens
McCarthy
McCulloch
McMillan
Macdonald,
Mass.
MacGregor
Mayne
Melcher
Meskill
Miller, Calif.
Mink
Mize
Mollohan

Monagan
Morgan
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Pelly
Pepper
Philbin
Pickle
Pirnie
Podell
Powell
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Purcell
Quile
Quillen
Rees
Reifel
Riegler
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roudebush
Roussetot
Ruppe
St Germain
Sandman

Scherle
Schneebell
Schwengel
Sebelius
Sisk
Skubitz
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Stephens
Stokes
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Symington
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Tunney
Vander Jagt
Watson
Weicker
Whalen
White
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wold
Wyatt
Wylder
Yates
Yatron
Young
Zion

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Pepper.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Wylder.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Foreman.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Conte.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Mayne.
Mr. Podell with Mr. King.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Holfield with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Young with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Weicker.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Fish.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Zion.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Denney.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Crane.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Coughlin.
Mr. Koch with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Ellberg with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Stokes.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Brademas.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Bingham with Mrs. Mink.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Farbstein.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Symington.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Yates.

Messrs. McFALL, WILLIAM D. FORD, DULSKI, CAREY, GUDE, and HOSMER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1186, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 621.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. TAYLOR
Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 621 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 9306, as passed, as follows:

That in order to conserve and develop for the benefit, inspiration, education, recrea-

tional use, and enjoyment of the public certain significant islands and shoreline of the United States and their related geographic, scenic, and scientific values, there is hereby established the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore (hereinafter referred to as the "lakeshore") in Ashland and Bayfield Counties, Wisconsin, consisting of the area generally depicted on the map entitled "Apostle Islands National Lakeshore", numbered NL-AI-91,000, sheets 1 and 2, and dated June 1970. The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

Sec. 2. No lands held in trust by the United States for either the Red Cliff Band or Bad River Band of the Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, or for allottees thereof, shall be acquired or included within the boundaries of the lakeshore established by this Act, with the following exception:

If the Indians who own more than 50 per centum of the interest in allotment number 74 GL or allotment number 135 in the Red Cliff Reservation agree to sell the allotment to the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), the Secretary may consent to the sale on behalf of the other owners, purchase the allotment for the negotiated price and revise the boundaries of the lakeshore to include the allotment.

Sec. 3. The Secretary may acquire within the boundaries of the lakeshore lands and interests therein by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange, but lands and interests in lands owned by the State of Wisconsin may be acquired only by donation. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Federal property located within the boundaries of the lakeshore may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without transfer of funds to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for the purposes of the lakeshore.

Sec. 4. (a) With the exception of not more than eighty acres of land to be designated within the lakeshore boundaries by the Secretary as an administrative site, visitor center, and related facilities, as soon as practicable, any owner or owners of improved property on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition of such acquisition, retain for themselves and their successors or assigns a right of use and occupancy of the improved property for non-commercial residential purposes for a definite term not to exceed twenty-five years, or, in lieu thereof, for a term ending at the death of the owner, or the death of his spouse, whichever is the later. The owner shall elect the term to be reserved. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the fair market value of the property on the date of such acquisition less the fair market value on such date of the right retained by the owner.

(b) A right of use and occupancy retained pursuant to this section may be terminated with respect to the entire property by the Secretary upon his determination that the property or any portion thereof has ceased to be used for noncommercial residential or for agricultural purposes, and upon tender to the holder of a right an amount equal to the fair market value, as of the date of the tender, of that portion of the right which remains unexpired on the date of termination.

(c) The term "improved property", as used in this section, shall mean a detached, noncommercial residential dwelling, the construction of which was begun before January 1, 1967 (hereinafter referred to as "dwelling"), together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated, the said land being in the same ownership as the

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Burleson of Texas with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Price of Texas.
Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Beall of Maryland.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Riegler.
Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Wold.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Taft.

Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. McCarthy.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Melcher with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Charles Wilson with Mr. Roussetot.
Mr. White of Texas with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Whalen.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Findley.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Yatron with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Button.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Quile.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Lowenstein with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Schneebell.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Sebelius.
Mr. Pickle with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Langen.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Hicks with Mr. Casey.

dwelling, as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for the sole purpose of non-commercial residential use, together with any structures accessory to the dwelling which are situated on the land so designated.

Sec. 5. The Secretary shall permit hunting, fishing, and trapping on lands and waters under his jurisdiction within the boundaries of the lakeshore in accordance with the appropriate laws of Wisconsin and the United States to the extent applicable, except that he may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting, trapping, or fishing shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, fish or wildlife management, or public use and enjoyment. Except in emergencies, any regulations prescribing any such restrictions shall be put into effect only after consultation with the appropriate State agency responsible for hunting, trapping, and fishing activities.

Sec. 6. The lakeshore shall be administered, protected, and developed in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1, 2-4), as amended and supplemented; and the Act of April 9, 1924 (43 Stat. 90; 16 U.S.C. 8a et seq.), as amended, except that any other statutory authority available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resources may be utilized to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of the Act.

Sec. 7. In the administration, protection, and development of the lakeshore, the Secretary shall adopt and implement, and may from time to time revise, a land and water use management plan which shall include specific provision for—

(a) protection of scenic, scientific, historic, geological, and archeological features contributing to public education, inspiration, and enjoyment;

(b) development of facilities to provide the benefits of public recreation together with such access roads as he deems appropriate; and

(c) preservation of the unique flora and fauna and the physiographic and geologic conditions now prevailing on the Apostle Islands within the lakeshore: *Provided*, That the Secretary may provide for the public enjoyment and understanding of the unique natural, historical, scientific, and archeological features of the Apostle Islands through the establishment of such trails, observation points, exhibits, and services as he may deem desirable.

Sec. 8. There are authorized to be appropriated not more than \$4,250,000 for the acquisition of lands and interests in lands and not more than \$5,000,000 for the development of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore.

The motion was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 9306) was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

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

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response

to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we have completed quite an extensive program for the week, including every bill listed on the program, and will ask to go over upon the announcement of the program for next week.

Monday is Consent Calendar day.

Also on Monday there are 12 suspensions, as follows:

H.R. 16607, National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development Extension;

H.R. 15549, Seamen's Service Act;

H.R. 14678, penalties for illegal fishing in fishery zone;

S. 3153, conservation of protective coral reefs;

H.R. 10634, State income tax withholding for interstate transportation employees;

H.R. 13543, to establish a program of research and promotion for wheat;

H.R. 18686, to authorize the transfer of Burley tobacco acreage allotments;

H.R. 15978, continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

H.R. 18410, to establish the Fort Point National Historic Site, Calif.;

H.R. 1160, to establish the Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park;

H.R. 140, to establish the Andersonville National Historic Site, Ga.; and

H.R. 13934, to revise the boundaries of Minute Man National Historical Park.

In addition to the suspensions there is scheduled for consideration on Monday H.R. 18306, to authorize U.S. participation in certain international financial institutions, under an open rule with 2 hours of debate.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week the program is as follows:

Tuesday is Private Calendar day.

There is scheduled for consideration H.R. 17654, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, and we expect to conclude consideration.

Also scheduled are H.R. 18776, to establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, Mich., under an open rule with 2 hours of debate; and

H.R. 18583, Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970, subject to a rule being granted.

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

May I add, Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SISK), we are determined to, and plan definitely, to finish the legislative reorganization bill not later than Thursday of next week.

We ask the cooperation of Members in that regard. We also hope to get other business done next week but completion of the reorganization bill is one thing we said we would do before we left for the recess and it was one of the considerations involved in taking the recess. We would like to reiterate to Members that we are determined that that bill, which I think has been considered for 8 or 9 days already, shall be considered for 3 days next week; that is, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, the heart of the week, and that we will finish it at that time.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 14

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS FOR THE WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 14

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next week.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I make the further announcement that we will probably have the political broadcasting conference report next week.

STATUS OF ADMINISTRATION LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

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

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, from time to time, and recently with increasing frequency, there is comment and discussion about how well Congress and its committees are carrying out their responsibilities, in terms of consideration by the committees and the Congress of the various proposals that are sent to us by the President.

I think it is fair to state that the Committee on Ways and Means has had as heavy a workload in this 91st Congress as it has ever had in its entire history since its creation as a standing committee in 1802, and certainly the responsibilities which the committee has carried this Congress have been as heavy as those carried by any committee of the House. In view of this, and in order to permit facts to speak for themselves, I thought it might be helpful to all Members to present in chart form the status of legislative recommendations submitted by President Nixon which fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means so as to show what action has been taken by the committee and the House on these recommendations.

Please note when you review this summary chart which I shall place in the RECORD that some of these subject headings encompass a vast amount of both committee and staff work in terms of volume and complexity. Also it will be noted that in terms of "major" proposals, there are, literally, only two, among the many which have been received, on which the Committee on Ways and Means has not yet taken action, and a part of one of these was considered in connection with the Tax Reform Act.

The chart to which I refer follows:

STATUS OF LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS AS OF SEPT. 10, 1970

I. Messages of the President—Subject matter	Date of message	Date draft bill received	Status of proposal
Tax revision.....	Apr. 21, 1969.....	None.....	Action completed (7 weeks of public hearings, beginning on Feb. 18, 1969, followed by 38 days in executive session; Public Law 91-172, H.R. 13270, the Tax Reform Act of 1969).
Debt limit.....	(1) February 24, 1969.....	March 5, 1969.....	Action completed (Public Law 91-8, H.R. 8508—Tax reform hearings interrupted for public hearing and executive consideration of debt limit).
	(2) May 14, 1970.....	None.....	Action completed (Public Law 91-301, H.R. 17802—Trade hearings interrupted for public hearing and executive consideration of debt limit).
Income tax surcharge and excise taxes.....	March 26, 1969.....	do.....	Action completed (public hearing followed by 7 days in executive session; Public Law 91-53, H.R. 9951; Public Law 91-172, H.R. 13270).
Airway user charges.....	June 16, 1969.....	June 17, 1969.....	Action completed (1 week of public hearings followed by 6 days in executive session; Public Law 91-253, title II, H.R. 14465, the Airport and Airway Revenue Act of 1970).
Unemployment insurance.....	July 8, 1969.....	July 8, 1969.....	Action completed (1 week of public hearings, followed by 6 days in executive session; Public Law 91-373, H.R. 14705, the Employment Security Amendments of 1970).
Drug control, etc.....	July 14, 1969.....	July 15, 1969.....	Committee action completed (following public hearing and executive consideration, language transmitted to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for inclusion as title II in omnibus bill reported to House.)
Welfare revision.....	Aug. 11, 1969.....	Oct. 2, 1969.....	Committee action completed (4 weeks of public hearings (including social security proposals) followed by 6 weeks in executive session; H.R. 16311, the Family Assistance Act of 1970, passed House Apr. 16, 1970).
Revenue sharing.....	Aug. 13, 1969.....	Sept. 23, 1969.....	No action as yet.
Social security.....	Sept. 25, 1969.....	Sept. 30, 1969.....	Committee action completed (H.R. 15095, providing a 15-percent increase in social security benefits effective Jan. 1, 1970, enacted Dec. 30, 1969 (title X, Public Law 91-172) (President had requested 10-percent increase effective Mar. 1, 1970); 4 weeks of public hearings (including welfare revision proposals) followed by 6 weeks in executive session; H.R. 17550, the Social Security Amendments of 1970, passed House May 21, 1970).
Trade and tariffs.....	Nov. 18, 1969.....	Nov. 18, 1969.....	Committee action completed (5 weeks of public hearings followed by 5 weeks in executive session; H.R. 18970, the Trade Act of 1970, reported to House Aug. 21, 1970).
Tax burdens of small business.....	Mar. 20, 1970.....	Apr. 21, 1970.....	No action as yet on proposal per se; however, some parts of subject considered in connection with Tax Reform Act.
Tax recommendations:			
(1) Accelerated collection of estate and gift taxes.....	Apr. 3, 1970.....	July 30, 1970.....	Public hearings commenced on Sept. 9, 1970.
(2) Tax on lead additives in gasoline.....	May 19, 1970.....	do.....	Do.
(3) Extension of certain excise taxes.....	do.....	do.....	Do.

I. OTHER DRAFT BILLS TRANSMITTED BY EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION FROM EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF PRESENT ADMINISTRATION AND REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Date referred	Subject	Action taken	Date referred	Subject	Action taken
Mar. 25, 1969	Treasury—income tax treatment of certain distributions pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1969.	No action as yet (H.R. 9451, Mr. Mills; legislation from another committee necessitating this action not yet enacted (H.R. 6578, reported in Senate Aug. 10, 1970)).	Oct. 15, 1969	HEW—to amend the Social Security Act to improve the cost effectiveness of the medicare, Medicaid, and maternal and child health programs.	Committee action completed (H.R. 17550, passed House May 21, 1970).
Apr. 2, 1969	Labor—collection of Federal unemployment tax in quarterly installments, etc.	Action completed (Public Law 91-53, H.R. 9951).	Dec. 2, 1969	Defense—to extend temporary provision for duty-free entry of gifts not exceeding \$50 retail value from members of the Armed Forces in combat zones.	Action completed (Public Law 91-180 H.R. 15071).
Apr. 30, 1969	Treasury—to establish a working capital fund for the Treasury.	Committee action completed (H.R. 16199, passed House May 19, 1970).	Apr. 7, 1970	State—to continue until the close of Sept. 30, 1973, the International Coffee Agreement of 1968.	Hearings completed; no further action as yet.
May 5, 1969	Bureau of the Budget—to eliminate limitation on number of civilian officers and employees in the executive branch.	Enactment as amendment to second Supplemental Appropriation Act (Public Law 91-47).	Apr. 16, 1970	Commerce—to eliminate the duty now applicable to natural rubber containing fillers, extenders, pigments, etc.	No action as yet.
June 9, 1969	Treasury—extension of interest equalization tax.	Action completed (Public Law 91-128, H.R. 12829).	May 27, 1970	Renegotiation Board—to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951.	No action as yet (Renegotiation Act does not expire until June 30, 1971; this is a minor proposal relating only to rate of interest imposed after finding has been made and case is under appeal).
July 8, 1969	HEW—to limit Federal financial participation under public assistance and Medicaid laws with respect to individuals in mental institutions.	Committee action completed (H.R. 17550, passed House May 21, 1970).	June 10, 1970	Transportation—to extend the duration of the highway trust fund.	Committee has completed action to extend for 3 additional years except for formal approval of draft language.
July 16, 1969	Treasury—to facilitate the management of the public debt by removing the interest rate ceilings on Government bonds, etc.	Action completed (Public Law 91-130, H.R. 14020).	July 29, 1970	Treasury—to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to grant to the transferee of merchandise in bonded warehouse the right to administrative review of customs decisions.	No action as yet.
Do.....	Treasury—to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit charges for certain services.	No action as yet. (H.R. 16198, Mr. Mills).			
July 30, 1969	Transportation—(1) to provide additional revenues for the highway trust fund; and (2) to provide for the imposition of waterway user charges.	No action as yet; however, see item below re extending highway trust fund.			

CURB IMPORTS—STOP EXPORTING PENNSYLVANIA JOBS

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in the coming fight on international trade it will be helpful to get as many viewpoints as possible.

Milton Shapp, formerly with the U.S. Commerce Department, and now a candidate for Governor of my home State of Pennsylvania, is a recognized expert in this field.

Mr. Shapp's position is clearly stated in the following address he presented to the district 6 meeting of the United Electrical Workers in Erie, Pa., on June 27, 1970.

I strongly recommend that all my colleagues study Mr. Shapp's message very carefully before considering action on any future trade legislation.

The statement follows:

UNITED ELECTRICAL WORKERS, DISTRICT 6
MEETING—ERIE, PA.

CURB IMPORTS—STOP EXPORTING
PENNSYLVANIA JOBS

In 1961, as a consultant to the U.S. Department of Commerce, I participated in the discussions which resulted in the drafting of the present tariff laws.

I was an advocate of freer world trade. Even so, I was fearful at the time that because many foreign countries enjoyed a wide margin over American manufacturers in the use of more modern (post war design) machine tools and paid much lower wages than American workers earned, our nation would fall behind other nations in the production of consumer and commercial goods.

And I still would be a champion of open world trade today if not for four major factors:

1. The flood of imports in such major industries as electronics, steel, textiles, shoes, apparel, glass, chemicals, and others has reached such flood proportions that millions of American jobs are threatened.

2. Other nations through tariffs, taxes, quotas and other restrictions are keeping out U. S. goods.

3. Nixon's economic policies have created an economic recession which is leading to a depression with high unemployment nationwide.

4. Unfortunately, national recessions have always hit hardest and fastest in Pennsylvania and thus the Commonwealth faces a bleak future unless industries in this state receive protection. When the rest of the nation catches an economic cold, we get pneumonia.

NIXON MUST REVERSE POLICIES

And so, until such time as the Nixon Administration reverses its policies and seeks to expand the national economy and create more jobs (just as John Kennedy was doing at the time the present tariff law was written) I must and will fight to protect existing jobs in our nation and particularly in Pennsylvania.

It is important to analyze another major factor that has brought our nation into this serious position. Stated briefly—we have lost World War 2½.

By treaties at the end of World War II, we prevented our defeated enemies, Germany and Japan, from producing war goods. Thus, their industrial leaders were forced to concentrate on the production and marketing of consumer, commercial and industrial products. Under the Marshall Plan, we poured almost 100 billion dollars into war torn Europe and Asia to help rebuild their economies and launch their post-war manufacturers into operation.

However, it was not these acts in themselves which put us into our current crisis. We were duty-bound to help those war torn countries. But on the other hand, we were not duty-bound to make the next step, which was to achieve for ourselves a world stranglehold on the war material market.

Today, belatedly, we wake up to the realization that our foreign competitors have virtually stolen not only worldwide markets for consumer and commercial products, but are likewise sweeping our domestic markets. True, lower wages are a factor. But we delude ourselves if we do not recognize another extremely important factor. Foreign businesses devoted themselves diligently to producing non-military products and concentrated on marketing these products. Meanwhile, American manufacturers of electronics, aircraft, hardware, pharmaceuticals and chemical products devoted a major portion of their effort to gaining a worldwide monopoly for their products as part of our military armaments. Even many apparel manufacturers found it profitable and much simpler to produce their products for the military, than to establish consumer markets.

Now, our nation feels the pinch. We are the world's leading producer of war products. But, even our own citizens protest. We produce equipment for which this nation must generate its own markets—and this is a frightening prospect. It might be of greater value to the future of this nation if the Nixon Administration were to take the money now being spent for ABM's and MIRV's and the obsolete-before-built battleships and subsidize commercial industries to develop markets for products for peace.

ESTABLISH OFFICE FOR CONVERSION

As Governor of Pennsylvania, I shall establish an Office of Conversion to help our manufacturers convert military production to consumer goods, but this would be of much greater value if accomplished on a national basis.

Coupled with its present emphasis on war goods, the Nixon Administration has managed to achieve an additional fantastic situation—rapidly increasing inflation along with rising unemployment in the middle of a war boom economy.

Even the captains of big business will not allow this situation to continue much longer. The alert was sounded recently by the President of the Bank of America. The war must end, he said. "It's bad for business." The Undersecretary of the Treasury joined in and said, "The war is bad for the stock market." The head of IBM also deplores our military position, as "bad for everyone."

Against this background, I should like to discuss some of the gravest elements of the import threat. Imports affect many industries, but the strongest challenges today as

far as Pennsylvanians are concerned are coming in electronics, footwear, steel and apparel fields. I wonder how many Pennsylvanians realize the importance of these industries to their state.

For example, our largest employer is steel with over 280,000 workers. In the textile-footwear-apparel industries, Pennsylvania ranks eleventh among the states in the percentage of its work force employees. Some 270,000 persons work in this field. The electronics industry employs more than 150,000 in Pennsylvania.

The flood of imports hitting the electronics industry is severely cutting employment in Pennsylvania and nationwide. I know of no major American radio set manufacturer that wires its chassis in the United States. The components (largely foreign) are assembled in Japan, Taiwan, the Philippines, Hong Kong, South Korea and then the chassis are shipped to the states for insertion in cabinets. Likewise, over 4,000,000 TV sets per year are assembled overseas for American manufacturers and merely inserted into their cabinets here and sold as if they were indeed American-made products.

Tape recorders, Hi Fi equipment, switch gears, transformers, tape cassettes, transistor radios, electronic control circuits, computer cards, fire detection equipment and hundreds of other electronic items are assembled overseas and sold in the United States mostly by American firms under American trade names. It is impossible to calculate the tens of thousands of American jobs lost because of this practice.

In the apparel field there seems to be an endless flow of imports. Cloth, shirts, suits, blouses, under garments, brassieres, jockstraps, socks, curtains, (you name it) pouring in from Japan, Taiwan, Hong Kong, the Philippines and yes, Portugal, Turkey and other low wage areas of the world, are inundating our market. Already this year, thousands of workers in Pennsylvania's apparel industry have lost their jobs, and many manufacturers have closed their doors.

The shoe industry is also hit very hard. Pennsylvania is one of the major shoe producing states in the Union. There are approximately 150 shoe factories here, employing close to 29,000 people. In 1968, these factories produced 85 million pairs of shoes. In 1969—due in large part to imports—this dropped to 78 million pairs. 1970 will see a further drop both in production and in jobs.

Some 200 million pairs of footwear are expected to be imported in the United States this year. If these shoes were to be manufactured in the States, it would mean 40,000 additional workers, working 40-hour weeks.

Of major concern is this fact. A large percentage of Pennsylvania's shoe and apparel manufacturers are located in small towns scattered throughout the state. Often these companies are the major employers in the communities in which they operate. Thus, a major cut in the work force or worse, closing of these plants, might cause a major economic collapse bordering on catastrophe in these areas.

WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA MAY LOSE STEEL PRODUCTION

Our steel areas particularly in the western part of the state, are likewise in a critical position. As our production slackens due to the combined effects of the Nixon recession and the quantity of imports, many of our mills—particularly in western Pennsylvania—are in danger of being shut down and may never open again. The steel industry in the past six years has built tremendous overcapacity in Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan and Wisconsin along the shore of the Great Lakes. These plants are more modern than our open-hearth rolling mill plants and are located in the Great Lakes area where combined raw and finished material shipping

costs are lower. Thus, any long term decline in steel demand may create ghost towns in the steel producing areas of western Pennsylvania.

The Journal of Commerce reported recently that the steel industry has estimated the impact of increased steel imports equal the "exporting of 70,000 jobs." Under existing circumstances, many of these jobs might be lost permanently in Pennsylvania unless we stop the flood of steel imports.

We can add to the list. Other products flood our markets. For example, few, if any, sewing machines—even those bearing American brand names—are made in the U.S.A. American typewriter production is dried up. Many items of sporting goods such as baseball gloves, basketballs, ping pong paddles and balls are made almost totally overseas. Watches, clocks, and quality glass production in the United States is virtually ended . . . and the list goes on . . .

Many of these suppliers of foreign goods are foreign companies, owned by local people. However, an increasing number of foreign manufacturers are joint ventures with local and American capital involved.

But there is a new trend developing that forebodes even heavier penetration of our markets by foreign made goods.

An example of this involves Burlington Industries, one of America's largest textile and carpet manufacturers. Burlington Industries, according to the Japan Economic Journal last March 10, has signed an agreement with Mitsubishi Rayon Co., Ltd., to manufacture carpets, primarily for the U.S. market. We have a good number of carpet mills here in Pennsylvania, in Philadelphia and Carlisle. How many jobs will be lost in our state due to this combine?

This is a whole new trend which the Nixon Administration has failed to even note in international trade—the multi-national conglomerate. In their most common form, these conglomerates use American capital to underwrite production of goods for the American market in foreign countries where labor costs are lower. They are then marketed here under American trade names.

Let's run down a brief list of such operations from news items culled from the business press. Ford Motor Company is Britain's biggest exporter. Weyenburg Shoe Manufacturing Co. of Milwaukee is building a \$4.8 million plant in Dundalk, Ireland, and plans to export the plant's entire output of 750,000 pairs annually to the United States.

The Cummins Engine Co., of Fort Wayne, Indiana, says it has captured 25 per cent of the United States diesel engine market for medium-duty commercial vehicles with engines made in Darlington, England.

The U.S. Department of Commerce reports that between 1950 and 1968, U.S. multi-nationals increased their direct U.S. investment abroad from \$10 million to more than \$60 million.

Fortune Magazine reports that the buying of cheap labor and parts abroad and selling the finished product in the United States at American prices merely tells part of the story. Fortune says these firms "can also adjust prices on these intra-company sales according to a deliberate plan . . . a useful device for keeping down the overall corporate tax liability."

These kinds of activity threaten the economic health of this nation. It is an attempt by some greedy people to kill the American golden goose, to destroy the economic system which has been built up over the years and through the combined work of labor unions and conscientious management has brought our people the world's highest standard of living.

STOP EXPORTING JOBS

I say that the time has come for Pennsylvania to stop exporting jobs by permitting the virtual unlimited import of goods.

We must put pressure on the Nixon Administration because we cannot expect to continue to dry up the job market for Americans and still expect them to consume goods.

In the long run, our world trade problem is not one of free trade or protectionism. It is one of fair standards and fair competition.

As a nation, as a political entity, as a trade market, as a pool of workers long guaranteed rights and benefits through unionism, we must now look to extend these protections to workers in other nations.

NEED IS FOR WORLDWIDE LABOR STANDARDS

We cannot permit cut-throat world competition based upon coolie labor standards any more than we can permit such competition here at home. We erected minimum wage laws at home to eliminate the sweatshop and outright wage slavery. Trade policy in the United States must be a legitimate weapon to establish fair labor standards and fair competition among our trading partners.

The theoretical goal of free trade will never be possible unless we work to have the labor forces of other nations put on an equal footing with our own. This cut-throat competition between nations based on exploiting lower-priced labor can only be destructive to our own economy.

And while I am talking about labor costs, let me knock a hole in another myth that is repeated so often it is accepted as fact: that the American consumer gets the benefit of these lower foreign labor costs. The labor cost, for instance, of producing a Japanese Toyota automobile is about \$1.40 per hour compared to \$5.31 an hour for a U.S. auto. But the Toyota costs nearly as much as a low-priced American compact when sold here in the United States. Who is getting the bulk of that wage differential? Not the American consumer.

The multi-national firms I talked about now import manual typewriters and sewing machines to displace the American-made products. But the prices of these products continue to zoom. Who is getting the benefit of these inflationary prices? Again, not the American consumer.

This brings us to some of the strange practices of some foreign countries who are hungry to exploit the rich U.S. market at the expense of their own consumers at home. It is becoming increasingly difficult in the United States for instance, to buy a cassette tape recorder that is not made in Japan or West Germany. Other Japanese electronic goods are becoming equally prevalent.

But did you know that you can buy a Japanese color television set here at half the price it costs a consumer in Japan?

This is the same Japan which is now fighting to prevent establishment of plants in Taiwan and Korea by U.S. firms because it knows the coolie wages in those countries will undercut Japan's own domestic products.

This is, by the way, no defense of these firms. Their real purpose is to build trade on human misery for export purposes, not develop underdeveloped countries and build living standards, just as General Electric uses cheap Mexican labor just across the borders of Texas and California to make components at low prices for resale in the States.

What I am saying is that this is the kind of hard reality we must fight as a nation before we can talk about the ideal of free world trade.

SUMMARY

In summary, we must establish trade policies today which are consistent with the realities of the present world because that is the only world we have. I am for extended trade but we can permit trade expansion only if we develop world monetary policies that

permit it, wage policies that make for fair competition and two-way orderly trade among trading partners.

U.S. trade policy must be shaped to achieve these objectives. We must insist upon fair wage competition. When we do, we will help workers in other nations raise their standards above present sweatshop conditions. Perhaps we cannot obtain the world equivalent of a Fair Labor Standards Act. We can, however, use trade policy as a means of helping workers in other nations get better wages and better working conditions and also equalize import prices.

Our objective must not and cannot be to choke world trade. But we can insist on fair treatment and fair competition.

This is the policy I personally advocate. It is what I would favor as Governor of Pennsylvania.

It is a policy that must be adopted soon. We in the United States must reverse direction and limit the flood of imports until such time as our own economy moves into high gear again and creates new jobs to provide opportunities for those being replaced by foreign workers.

We must move the Nixon Administration which has become a reluctant dragon to establish quotas on more than just textiles as now contemplated in Congress, but on electronic goods, machine tools, steel and other items that threaten to put American men and women out of work. The Nixon Administration's reluctant support for textile quotas is too little—and obviously—too late.

The Nixon Administration is derelict in not moving in quick, concerted fashion to save jobs at home at a time when inflation and recession is destroying the American economy.

We must re-establish as our goal the fulfillment of the Full Employment Act of 1946 and not sacrifice employment opportunities of our own people by making them pawns in the fight to stop inflation.

President Nixon must be forced to realize that we are engaged in a war of survival here at home. He must reduce our dependence upon military expenditures, take steps to increase not cool down the national economy, and adopt import-export policies that will permit American consumer goods and commercial manufacturers to expand their production and increase employment.

As Governor of the nation's third largest state, my voice will be raised loud, clear and often to gather support for such policies.

CONGRESS TAKES THE LEAD IN PROVIDING INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR HOMEOWNERS AND SMALL BUSINESSMEN IN LARGE CITIES

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, last month the Subcommittee on Housing in the House Committee on Banking and Currency, chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT) included a milestone provision in the 1970 housing bill which, if enacted, will provide adequate insurance coverage for the residents of our large central cities. Every Member of the House knows that individual homeowners and small businessmen simply cannot get adequate insurance coverage today. The insurance industry, frightened by civil disturbances in the past few years, has reneged on their responsibility to provide insurance coverage in our cities.

In 1968 the Congress attempted to provide some kind of basic insurance coverage for those people whose policies were cancelled. As the Congress has found out through investigations, the 1968 insurance provision establishing the so-called fair plans has not done the job which we intended. In 1969 at the direction of the distinguished chairman of the Housing Subcommittee (Mr. BARRETT) hearings were held in my home city of Chicago to look into the collapse of the fair plan operation in Chicago. The subcommittee found out that not only were citizens not informed of the availability of fire insurance coverage under the fair plan, but that those lucky few who were insured under the fair plan had their premiums increased, in some cases, 1,000 percent. The result of the subcommittee investigation was the introduction of my bill, H.R. 13666, which has been cosponsored by over 100 Members of the House, which for the first time, will provide direct Federal writing of adequate insurance in our cities. This direct Federal writing would only be implemented when and if insurance rates exceeded the manual rate by 175 percent. The intent of my bill is to establish a Federal yardstick to keep insurance companies from writing premiums too high and to provide total insurance coverage including crime insurance, burglary and theft insurance, and malicious mischief insurance for our citizens. It is this bill that has been included in the 1970 housing bill, H.R. 19100.

I take this opportunity to praise Chairman BARRETT for his longstanding attempts to have the Congress provide adequate insurance coverage. His long-term interest in this problem and his outstanding and stalwart support of my bill deserves recognition and praise. Congressman BARRETT knows the insurance problem firsthand since he has been told that his homeowner's insurance policy and his office insurance policy will probably be canceled very soon. The only reason given is that he lives in the wrong type of neighborhood. He has not had a claim with his company in over 50 years. He has almost singlehandedly brought the whole insurance problem to the attention of the Congress. His cooperation with me in the subcommittee investigations and subsequent hearings on my bill represents outstanding work.

I would like to take this opportunity also to praise the chairman of the full committee, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN), who has also cooperated with me in every way and has encouraged me in my efforts to obtain adequate insurance for our citizens. Congressman BILL MOORHEAD, of Pittsburgh, has been one of the most effective supporters of my bill in the subcommittee consideration. Mr. MOORHEAD chaired the special hearings of the subcommittee held in Chicago and has demonstrated since then a great knowledge of the insurance industry and the problems people have in obtaining adequate insurance coverage. The members of the Housing Subcommittee have also been most cooperative and willing to listen to my pro-

posals and have acted in a very intelligent and forthright manner. Congressman WIDNALL of New Jersey, has also evidenced concern over this whole problem and has given me bipartisan support for my efforts. Although he does not agree with me on the provisions of my bill, he has certainly recognized the need that exists here.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD following my remarks an article appearing in today's Wall Street Journal on the whole problem of insurance in our cities:

FEDERAL PRESSURE IS MOUNTING ON INSURERS TO MAKE CRIME POLICIES AVAILABLE IN CITIES

(By Carol H. Falk)

WASHINGTON.—Like many city folk these days, Rep. Barrett (D., Pa.) got some bad news from his insurance company a few weeks back.

The company said it was considering cancelling the insurance policies on his Philadelphia home and office, though he has never filed a claim in 50 years. The only apparent reason is that both are located in a poor, working-class neighborhood not far from a public-housing project that was the scene of recent racial confrontations.

But unlike his neighbors, Rep. Barrett is in a position to tackle the problem. As the second-ranking Democrat on the House Banking Committee, the Philadelphia Congressman heads a subcommittee that, at the time the word came from his insurance company, just happened to be considering a bill that would put the Federal Government in the property-insurance business.

"I was very much for the bill all along," says Rep. Barrett. "Many places where I live have gone out of business." However, he says his personal experience was a good way to bring the extent of the problem home to his colleagues. The bill won subcommittee approval for inclusion in a broad package of housing legislation.

While the measure is still a long way from law, its growing popularity reflects mounting pressure on the insurance industry to do something about the availability of crime insurance in urban areas.

TALKING ABOUT SOLUTIONS

Amid dire predictions that the urban businessman can't survive much longer without burglary and theft insurance at prices he can afford, not only Congress but the Nixon Administration and some segments of the insurance industry itself have begun to talk about possible solutions. The hitch is that no one likes anyone else's idea. As things stand now:

The industry is violently opposed to the bill under consideration by Congress, and the Nixon Administration regards it as an extreme solution.

Federal Insurance Administrator George Bernstein has come up with a proposal, but many Congressmen and industry representatives don't think it will work.

The insurance companies that sell most of the crime insurance prefer still another solution, but other insurance companies, the Federal Insurance Administrator and state insurance regulators don't like it.

In the meantime, urban residents and small businessmen have almost despaired of a way out of the problem, which assumed serious proportions following the urban riots of the late 1960s. In January 1968 a Presidential panel studying riot-affected areas of Boston, Cleveland, Detroit, Newark, Oakland and St. Louis reported that 40% of the business establishments and institutions responding were having significant burglary and theft-insurance problems.

And the situation continues to deteriorate. An official of the New York Insurance Brokers

Council told Mr. Bernstein last May that "in most areas in New York City it is impossible to get" burglary and theft insurance.

In a July report on crime insurance availability released by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Mr. Bernstein added that while the storekeeper who can't remain in business without crime coverage may present the overriding social problem, the urban resident faces similar difficulties. "Few knowledgeable persons would claim," he said, "that a single working girl residing in an apartment in New York City can obtain burglary coverage, or that a middle-class family in Chicago can readily insure their personal property against theft."

In urging Congressional action on the problem, Sen. Tydings (D., Md.), who, along with Rep. Annunzio (D., Ill.) sponsored the bill Rep. Barrett's subcommittee approved, observes that it doesn't take an outright cancellation to make insurance unavailable to many people. He notes that some premiums have been raised 300% or more, "well out of the reach of the average city dweller."

The Insurance Administrator's study points up the rate increases. A survey found that in Los Angeles County a \$3,000 burglary insurance policy that cost \$113 in 1962 cost \$236 by 1969. Over the same period, annual premiums soared to \$1,028 from \$395 for \$15,000 burglary coverage on a furniture store in the District of Columbia.

In 1968 a Federally sponsored plan offered relief in the area of fire insurance. Legislation passed that year set up a Federal reinsurance program to be available to companies if they agreed to participate in state pooling arrangements (called Fair Access to Insurance Requirements or FAIR plans). The plans were set up to absorb the inner-city fire insurance business rejected by individual companies, but burglary and theft insurance weren't included and vandalism and malicious mischief are just being added.

One insurance man concedes that the industry, for practical purposes, isn't writing urban burglary and theft insurance at all. He describes the risks that insurers are willing to accept as about on a par with the traditional definition of a good fire insurance risk: "Pig iron under water."

And the insurance industry, which agrees on very little else, pleads helplessness, maintaining that it can't be expected to bear the entire cost of high crime losses in the inner city.

Rep. Annunzio and Sen. Tydings believe that the industry might be persuaded to bear a bit more of the burden, however, if the Federal Government entered the field not only as a regulator but as a potential competitor. The real goal of their measure, according to Congressional sources, is largely to pressure private industry into providing more crime insurance at reasonable prices.

The complex bill essentially would require the inclusion of crime insurance, as well as fire, in the companies' state insurance pools and would provide for direct Federal writing of all property insurance if excessive private or pool rates (defined as those equal to 175% of the minimum for the category) couldn't be justified by state regulators to the satisfaction of Federal authorities.

"The idea," explains a Capitol Hill source, "is to give the Federal Insurance Administrator some clout in dealing with the industry and with state regulatory bodies. He'll be able to say, 'If you don't straighten out, the Federal Government will write the insurance directly.' It would put the burden on the states to prove that the rates weren't unreasonable. If there's anything this industry doesn't want, it's a Federal yardstick."

A NOTICEABLE PANIC

Indeed, there was noticeable panic among industry lobbyists when the Annunzio-Tydings proposal was approved by Rep. Barrett's subcommittee. Although the bill has

to surmount some opposition in the full committee, get through the House Rules Committee and a floor vote, as well as the House-Senate conference on the housing legislation, "The industry is still running around like ants after the initial shock," says one Congressional observer.

The industry is becoming aware of the proposal's considerable political appeal, especially for Congressmen facing tough reelection campaigns in urban areas.

"We're just a little more scared than we were before," a spokesman for the National Association of Independent Insurers concedes. Whether the industry is scared enough to offer a viable alternative is yet to be seen; "The Annunzio thing is strictly a lead pipe being bounced off our skulls to get us to agree on something," complains an American Insurance Association spokesman.

The American Mutual Insurance Alliance calls the bill "simplistic." A spokesman says, "This doesn't solve the problem of crime, though it does bring some indemnification back to the victim." Arguing that assurance of indemnification might actually encourage businessmen to neglect protective measures and localities to be lax about law enforcement, he asserts that "in a way, crime insurance is subsidizing crime."

Andre Maisonnier, vice president of the alliance, argues that another beneficiary of what he calls "an artificial barrier on premium charges" would be the slum landlord.

The alliance has had a committee studying the crime insurance problem for two years, but hasn't come up with any action proposals other than to "eliminate crime." The group maintains that the matter "is a social problem with some insurance aspects—not an insurance problem."

The AIA says direct Federal writing of insurance is unrealistic and unnecessary. It contends that for the Government to become an insurance company, "thousands of people" would be needed to staff the operation.

Federal Insurance Administrator Bernstein, while showing some relish for the additional clout the proposed bill would give him, warns: "Once the Federal Government is in the insurance business, it will expand." Before he resorts to any Federal solution, he says, he wants to give the states and private enterprise a chance to solve the problem. And to persuade them to take this responsibility he's using the power that the Annunzio-Tydings proposal gives him by its very existence.

Mr. Bernstein is offering the industry a buffer against the dreaded Federal solution awaiting it on Capitol Hill. His alternative is a state plan proposed in the report that HUD released in July. This plan would require all property insurers in states with crime insurance problems to participate in pools through which applicants refused insurance by individual companies could obtain burglary and theft coverage. Mr. Bernstein calculates that, unlike the FAIR plans for fire insurance, crime insurance pools are certain to have losses so high that people couldn't afford the premiums. Therefore he suggests that states consider a subsidy paid for by a tax on premiums on all other property insurance sold in the state—a tax he estimates could range from 0.2% in a state like California to 2.2% in the District of Columbia.

A HARD PLAN TO SELL

The main criticism of this plan is that it's going to be hard to sell in state legislatures. Congressional critics and insurance people alike note that state legislators aren't going to be eager to tax their rural and suburban constituents to subsidize crime insurance for the central city.

A little legislative arm-twisting to make the Bernstein proposal work, however, is being considered by a subcommittee of the Senate Banking Committee, which isn't as warm to the Annunzio-Tydings bill as is its

House counterpart. The Senate group has reached a "tentative policy decision" favoring a program for direct Federal writing of crime insurance to be implemented in those states that fall to deal with the problem by the end of the next legislative session. Committee sources say details of the plan and just what conditions would trigger Federal insurance in a given area will probably differ from those in the Annunzio-Tydings bill. The panel resumes its deliberations tomorrow.

At present, the only leverage Mr. Bernstein has to get states to accept his plan is a threat to withdraw the so-called Federal riot reinsurance covering fire insurance, if states with critical problems fail to take action by the end of the next full legislative session. "We have no direct power over the states," admits Mr. Bernstein. "They can thumb their noses at us."

The fact is that after several summers without major riot losses, many insurance companies are losing some of their enthusiasm for the Federal riot reinsurance fund, which has collected \$64 million in premiums from the companies and paid out only \$2.8 million in claims since 1968. "There's no incentive for the insurance companies to push for this plan," says one industry representative. "Their premiums are high enough anyway."

Because Mr. Bernstein's plan gives the states till the end of their next legislative session to comply—and a few state legislatures don't even meet until 1972—critics fear all it will do is delay a real solution another two years. But Mr. Bernstein insists that the key states will have made their decision by mid-1971.

Mr. Bernstein is talking tough at this point to line up support. "We're asking the states to put their money where their mouth is," he says. "Our philosophy is to leave insurance regulation with the states, but we're not about to let them botch it in the burglary field."

The only firm promise of support he has received thus far is from the National Association of Independent Insurers, which had proposed a plan identical to his except that the industry group, whose members sell a good deal of homeowner-type property insurance but very little specialized burglary and theft coverage, would apply the tax only to burglary and theft policies. Despite this difference, the NAII, whose chief goal is "to keep the Government out of this area as much as possible," says it is willing to lobby for Mr. Bernstein's plan in the state legislatures.

The American Insurance Association, the trade group whose members write over 80% of the crime insurance in the U.S., is less dedicated to a state solution and more skeptical about its prospects. The AIA says that though it's against the Government writing insurance directly, it would be willing to accept some Federal supervision in return for a Federal subsidy.

A spokesman explains that the association's preference is for early activation of a program under which the private insurers would act as fiscal intermediaries, receiving full reimbursement from the Government for all losses and expenses not covered by premiums collected.

The rest of the industry—larger than the AIA in terms of number of companies—as well as state regulators, tends to regard as heresy any such plan that would detract from the traditional state supervision of insurance companies.

And Mr. Bernstein makes clear that if there's to be a Federal solution he much prefers something like the Annunzio-Tydings plan to the AIA's suggestion of a Federal subsidy. He says that if the Federal Government is going to foot the bill he isn't about to let the industry run the program.

And if the industry doesn't line up fairly soon behind a solution that he considers more responsible than the AIA one (namely, his own proposal), Mr. Bernstein says he believes the Annunzio-Tydings bill might well pass Congress this session.

While he originally testified before the House subcommittee that the bill was "premature," now that his own plan is on the table he warns that "unless the state regulators and the industry take a firm position pretty quick . . . we will have to do a little rethinking." He stops short of promising outright Administration support for the pending bill but does say flatly that if the key states haven't produced workable crime insurance plans by mid-1971 "I'll be very quick to advise Congress we guessed wrong." He adds: "This Administration is committed to a solution. If that requires a Federal approach, we'll support it."

THE ENERGY CRISIS

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, for some time this country has been aware of the fact that we are approaching an "energy crisis."

Recently the Honorable Frank Ikard, president of the American Petroleum Institute and formerly a distinguished member of the House Committee on Ways and Means, addressed a Capitol Hill group on this crisis.

My colleagues, Hon. BOB POAGE, Hon. JOHN YOUNG, and Hon. J. J. PICKLE join me in presenting Mr. Ikard's statement.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE FRANK IKARD, PRESIDENT AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE

The "energy crisis" is much in the news these days, and its existence must be both a surprise and a puzzle to many Americans. They have been told that their nation has almost inconceivably large deposits of coal in the ground. They have read reports of huge potential reserves of oil and natural gas remaining to be discovered. They have heard many glowing predictions about the future of nuclear energy in power generation. To the public the energy crisis must seem a strange and paradoxical instance of scarcity in the midst of abundance.

However, the energy crisis certainly does exist. It has been brought about by a complex combination of factors and forces which I will attempt to explain in a simple and direct way.

First, of all, it is important to understand the magnitude of our energy use.

The U.S., with less than six per cent of the world's population consumes 32 per cent of the energy. Three-fourths of U.S. energy is supplied by oil and gas. A publication of the U.S. Interior Department expressed the role of energy in American life in these words:

"Energy, in all its forms and applications, infuses, pervades, and upholds the daily activities of Americans in particular to an extent never remotely approached by the people of any previous age. The American householder who uses a thousand kilowatt hours of electricity during a month for which he may pay as much as \$20 has had the energy equivalent of 60 men working for him on a normal 40-hour weekly schedule during that period. Driving his car down the road at seventy miles an hour he commands the energy equivalent of 1500 more. A locomotive engineer has at his disposal an energy equivalent of 100,000 men, and the effort of over half a million would be required to get a large jet transport into the air to its

normal cruising altitude and speed. Even to provide the light of an ordinary reading lamp for a single evening would absorb the physical output of one man working a full eight-hour day."

Let's consider the elements that have brought this energy-dependent nation face to face with a tightness of supply without peacetime precedent. Not necessarily in any order of impact or importance, these are the ingredients of the energy crisis:

1. The much-heralded nuclear age has not kept up with its timetable. Completion of nuclear power plants is running years behind schedule, putting extra strain on other energy sources. Furthermore, construction of nuclear power plants has encountered stiff resistance from environmentalists and from neighbors who are just plain scared.

2. The coal industry is plagued with problems. Much of the coal from operating mines cannot meet the sulfur content standards required under today's air pollution control regulations. This has resulted in a severe coal shortage despite enormously abundant quantities of coal in place.

The Mine Safety Act, which went into effect on March 31, despite its meritorious features, further hampers coal producers—particularly the smaller companies.

The coal storage problem can be solved eventually. New mines can be opened in the West, where the sulfur content of coal is lower. Sulfur oxide emissions from coal can also be curbed by the development of flue gas desulfurization technology. But these changes will take huge amounts of money and lots of time. Raising money is difficult for any industry these days and as for time—we just don't have it. The energy crisis is on us now.

3. Natural gas could play a major role in averting today's energy crisis. But production of this clean burning fuel has been crippled by federal wellhead regulation dating back to a 1954 Supreme Court decision. Natural gas has been made a non-competitive product in a reverse way. Instead of being over-priced out of the market it has been so under-priced by unrealistic federal controls that the search for new reserves is discouraged. Today, natural gas is part of the energy problem when—with better judgment—it could be providing much of the solution to the current crisis.

4. This leaves oil to take up the slack where the other energy sources cannot meet today's energy crisis demands. There is a particularly heavy drain on available supplies of low-sulfur residual fuel oil to serve markets that would otherwise use coal, natural gas, or nuclear energy, if any of these were available.

The pressure on the petroleum industry to meet this rapid surge in demand for oil is only one of the pressures on the industry today. The other pressures make it much harder for oilmen to come through for the nation in this time of energy crisis.

You recall the old-timer who said: "I have had many troubles in my day, but most of them never happened." The oil industry has many troubles right now, and they are happening. They are not imaginary. Let me give you some examples.

The Chase Manhattan Bank estimates that to meet the growth in demand expected for the 1970's the petroleum industry will have to invest more than \$300 billion in the Free World during this decade. This is over twice the level of expenditures for the 1960's. Even in the Sixties the industry's financing problems became more complicated. Traditionally, the petroleum industry had generated all but a small portion of its capital requirements from net earnings and provisions for capital recovery—notably depreciation and depletion. In recent years the industry has had to turn increasingly to the capital market—and especially to long-term borrowing.

A study of 37 leading U.S. companies, conducted by the First National City Bank of New York, found a capital gap—the funds that had to be sought from external sources—equal to 29 per cent of the total capital outlays of these companies in 1969.

This was the financial situation of the petroleum industry even before it felt the bite of the 1969 Tax Reform Act.

TAXES

It is estimated that this piece of legislation increased the petroleum industry's tax burden by about \$700 million annually. This breaks down as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

The cut in percentage depletion and the changed treatment of production payments	370
The minimum income tax, which includes percentage depletion among its so-called tax preference items	160
Repeal of the investment tax credit	170

The jolt of these tax increases was made even harder by the trend of recent years. A study of the 27 leading oil companies, just released by the Chase Manhattan Bank, revealed that the direct tax burden of these representative petroleum corporations increased by 245 per cent—or almost \$5 billion—between 1959 and 1969. The new tax increases will be added to the top of that rising pile.

It has been estimated that the effect of last year's tax measure is approximately equal to the 30 cents per barrel crude oil price reduction advocated by the Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Control.

IMPORTS

The API proposed to the President that there be a Cabinet level review of the oil import control program. We did this because the existing program, though sound in concept, was having its effectiveness impaired by the introduction of special exceptions.

The report that resulted from this review has become a subject of controversy. Much has been said about the differences between members of the petroleum industry and the Task Force majority. It is worth noting and emphasizing, however, that there are some vital points of agreement:

There is no difference of opinion, for instance, on the role of petroleum in national security.

There is no difference of opinion on the need to maintain a domestic producing industry able to carry the country through a worldwide supply crisis.

It is true that there are statistical differences about the availability of supplies from U.S. and Western Hemisphere sources in an emergency. But the central dispute is over mechanism. The Task Force majority believes that a tariff is a better method of regulating oil import controls. The petroleum industry feels it is a clumsy and unworkable mechanism.

We also feel that the sad experience with natural gas regulation points up the folly of trying to use a tariff to manipulate domestic crude oil prices.

The apparent area of disagreement seems to be narrowing because members of the Task Force staff are now saying that the majority report was misinterpreted. They are now claiming—publicly and privately—that more weight should be given to the report's comments in support of import controls in the interests of national security. They maintain they did not assign as much importance to the price question as a reading of the report would suggest.

It would seem that the advocates of increased imports of foreign oil suffered a severe setback for their position with these developments in the Middle East:

1. The continued closing of the Suez Canal.
2. The refusal of Syria to permit repair of a break in the Trans-Arabian Pipe Line—which took place under mysterious circumstances.

3. The sudden government-forced cutback in Libyan oil production.

This combination has put a tremendous strain on tanker capacity with the result that spot tanker charges have quadrupled over the space of a year. Consequently, Middle East and North African crude oil delivered to the U.S. East Coast now costs about 75 cents more per barrel than domestic production on the spot market.

This is probably only a temporary situation caused by an accumulation of adverse circumstances. But it could be repeated in more severe form at any time in the future.

The situation shows how very vulnerable and uncertain is this "low cost" foreign oil.

Protests against the present oil import quota system have come mainly from the East Coast and especially from the New England States. But think what a financial bind these states would be in today if they were completely dependent on what is currently that "high cost" foreign oil. It seems to me that this situation should encourage some second thoughts among those who want to do away with, or radically curtail, the present oil import control system. For now we have proof that the low cost of foreign oil is no more dependable than the supply itself.

Despite these developments, the President continues to be under tremendous pressure to break down the present oil import controls. The fact that he has not acted yet to implement the tariff proposal should not lull us into believing this plan—or some version of it—has been permanently shelved.

Whatever effect the continuing and widely publicized attack on oil import controls may have, one thing is certain: This attack is bound to have a psychological impact on investors. It is not helping one bit in the industry's efforts to finance the capital investment required to meet the nation's energy needs in this time of crisis.

Opponents of oil import controls have carried the battle right into the oil country with severe criticisms of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, and the commissions that regulate oil production in Louisiana and Texas.

These critics believe that the conservation agencies of Texas and Louisiana are, in effect, controlling oil prices. They feel that any control over the price of oil should be wielded by the federal government in Washington—and not by officials of producing states.

There's an old saying: "History teaches us that history teaches us nothing." The experience with federal regulation of natural gas—which has led directly to an acute and critical shortage of supply—should be sufficiently instructive to cure anyone of wanting to broaden federal control over petroleum production.

As for the charge that state conservation policies are actually a means of propping up crude oil prices, let's look at the record. The price of crude oil last year averaged less than four per cent above the level for the standard price index period 1957-1959.

By comparison, the wholesale price index for all commodities was up 13 per cent, and the retail price index was up 28 per cent.

The conservation commissions of Texas and Louisiana have done a magnificent job of stretching the nation's supply of oil and gas. But if they were really trying to prop up crude oil prices (as we know they were not), then they would have to be condemned as utter failures.

It goes without saying that blasts at policies adopted to prevent the physical and economic waste of oil and gas do nothing whatever to bring out the investment money

needed for the required expansion of domestic petroleum exploration and development. Every misinformed and irresponsible attack on oil and gas conservation policies helps to aggravate today's energy crisis.

Another problem that is adding to the difficulties and costs of the petroleum industry these days revolves around the current campaign for air and water conservation.

The record speaks for itself. The petroleum industry is 100 per cent committed to doing all in its power to clean up the environment. In fact, oil companies were active in this field many decades before environmentalism became a popular fad.

The U.S. Department of Commerce has reported that petroleum leads all American industries in its expenditures for air and water pollution control. The industry's outlays for these purposes now exceed \$1 million a day, with a substantial portion of this sum going for research and development.

Although much remains to be done, encouraging progress has already been made. For example, today's new automobiles give off less than a third of the unburned gasoline and carbon monoxide produced by cars of the early 1960's. Next year's new models will have devices to control evaporation losses from the carburetor and fuel tank, meaning a further important reduction in emissions.

There are rumors and reports that the gasoline engine can never be made sufficiently pollution free to meet acceptable air conservation standards. One story I picked up is that an old-time classic car—the Cord—is about to be revived as an electric automobile. Only this time it would be known as the Extension Cord.

Regardless of what you read or hear, the internal combustion engine can be made essentially pollution-free well before the end of this decade and long before any alternative means of propulsion can be perfected and put on the market.

We are also faced with an oil spills problem of major proportions and we know it. Some of you may know that St. Barbara is the patron saint of arsenals and powder magazines. It is an unhappy coincidence that the channel named after her should have been the site of an oil spill with explosive consequences for the petroleum industry.

The oil has been completely cleaned off the beaches there, but it is still smearing the industry's reputation.

We could defend ourselves by pointing to a drilling safety record that is even more spectacular than any oil spill that has occurred. Of some 9,000 wells drilled on the continental shelf through the end of 1969, only seven involved any spillage of oil. Other incidents have occurred this year, but even though they change the statistics they cannot impair what is an amazingly good record of safe operations under incredibly difficult conditions.

The petroleum industry is not taking refuge in statistics or excuses. It has developed, through the API, an action program for oil spills cleanup. More than a million dollars have been appropriated for this program through the end of 1970, with the expectation of even larger expenditures in the future.

The emphasis is on research for and development of more efficient ways of cleaning up oil spills, which are bound to occur occasionally even with the most extreme precautions.

With all the troubles and trials that the industry is now going through, there is some sunshine on the landscape. The nation's demand for oil and gas will considerably more than double between now and the start of the Twenty-first Century. This means the petroleum industry in Texas and elsewhere can have a bright and busy future if it is given a fair chance to do its job. This

is all we ask, and all we have a right to ask: A fair chance.

To get that fair chance we will have to get the facts about our industry, about the issues I have discussed and others before the public of the consuming states. This sounds much easier than it is. Today's vast expansion in the means of communication has been accompanied by tremendous competition for the public's attention.

We are trying to get the facts spread out in such a way that no one can ignore them or evade them.

I would place the communications problem high on the list of the most difficult and challenging tasks facing the petroleum industry today. But unless this one problem is solved, we cannot be very optimistic about the effective solution of the others. The entire petroleum industry realizes this, and is mapping its plans and directing its energies in accordance with this realization.

MERCURY POLLUTION

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, few "non-issues" have become "issues" faster than mercury pollution. It is a pollution problem which has been known in narrow circles for quite some time, but which has truly become a household phrase in the past few months.

Since findings last April of significant amounts of mercury pollution in the Great Lakes, the Federal Water Quality Administration has conducted an extensive survey of mercury contamination in waterways throughout the country. States have conducted similar surveys of their internal waters. Charges were filed against 10 industrial plants for discharging hazardous amounts of mercury into our Nation's waters.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture suspended the registration of some mercury compounds used for seed treatment, and canceled the registration of others used for slimicidal and laundering purposes. The National Governor's Conference adopted a resolution expressing their concern and asking for the establishment of "a minimum amount of mercury outflow which would not constitute a hazard to public health."

With an amazing amount of speed the Olin Corp. developed a device to measure and record almost instantaneously concentrations of mercury in air or water ranging from zero to 10 parts per billion—after, I might add, suits had been filed against two of its plants for mercury pollution.

Senator PHILIP HART has held hearings on the problem, as have the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources and agencies in a number of other States. An International Conference on Environmental Mercury Contamination will be held at the University of Michigan beginning on September 30.

With all this action regarding mercury pollution—and it is action which I regard as most welcome—there is one source of mercury pollution which has not been dealt with to any great extent, if at all. The fact appears to be that hospitals and laboratories may be a serious but so far overlooked—source of mercury pollution.

Mercury has long been used by hospitals and laboratories in the preparation and fixing of material for the making of slides is histopathological, histological and other laboratory work.

The problem is that we have no idea how much mercury is used by the 7,200 hospitals in this country, and we don't know what happens to that mercury after it is washed down their laboratory drains.

Mr. Speaker, I was first alerted to this source of possible mercury pollution by Dr. Clarence Tarzwell, director of the National Marine Water Quality Laboratory in West Kingston, R.I.

In the past 6 months since I began looking into the problem of mercury pollution, I have come across few people in any Federal agency who are as concerned or as knowledgeable about mercury pollution as Dr. Tarzwell. In fact, few people seemed concerned at all until a few months ago when a crisis occurred.

In my investigation, Dr. Tarzwell's name came before me repeatedly as a man who was obviously well respected in this area, and one who has long been concerned about the effects mercury can have upon our environment. Although Dr. Tarzwell has made no specific estimate of just how much mercury is used by hospitals, he apparently believes that "mercury pollution from laboratories remains an important and undoubtedly an ever-increasing problem." Certainly other types of data would seem to bear this out.

According to the American Hospital Association, for example, the number of admissions into community hospitals—those institutions with which we are most familiar which provide general and selected special services—has increased 23 percent in the past decade. The average daily number of persons in these hospitals has increased 36 percent over that time. Of greatest significance is the fact that outpatient visits to hospitals, two-thirds of which are for clinic visits or laboratory services, have increased from 70.7 million to 120.8 million, or 71 percent, from 1960 to 1969.

The American Hospital Association also reports that "the volume and types of laboratory work performed—in these hospitals—have increased substantially."

We can only assume that as patient loads have increased and as laboratory work has gone up, so has the consumption—and dumping—of mercury by hospitals and laboratories.

Many of my colleagues are undoubtedly aware of the hearings which Senator HART's Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources, and Environment has held on the subject of mercury pollution. Although these hearings have brought out many important facts about the danger to our environment from mercury and other heavy metals, they have not to date dealt with the possibility of mercury pollution from hospitals and laboratories.

Consequently, I have written a letter to Senator HART urging not only that his subcommittee study this aspect of the problem, but asking that Dr. Tarzwell be invited to testify.

I have urged Senator HART to have Dr.

Tarzwell testify for two reasons. First, we have a responsibility to obtain the knowledge which this gentleman seems to have about mercury pollution into the open so that pollution of this type can be quickly controlled and stopped; and, second, it appears Dr. Tarzwell has found an alternative method for the fixing of slides which does not require the use of mercury, and this alternative method is now being used in his laboratory.

While Dr. Tarzwell has indicated that such alternatives may be available to avoid the use of mercury altogether, at least two methods have been outlined for recovering mercury when it is used by laboratories. One method, which has been used at the National Marine Water Quality Laboratory, uses a sodium sulfite solution and another solution containing a mercuric chloride. The other method, now being used by a laboratory in Massachusetts, involves the placing of a few scraps of aluminum into a mercury-bearing solution and allowing it to stand overnight. The mercury precipitates out, and can be recovered.

Mr. Speaker, in testimony before Senator HART's subcommittee, it was estimated that 163 million pounds of mercury have been consumed in the United States since the beginning of this century. However, only about one-sixth of our annual consumption is recycled each year. What happens to the rest?

That, Mr. Speaker, is a good question, and one which requires a rapid answer. It is a tragedy that with all the information available on the toxicity of mercury we waited so long to recognize the problems it can cause. Part of the solution, if even only a small part, is to determine how much of this material is used by hospitals, how it is disposed of, and whether alternative methods can be found to avoid its use in the future.

I am enclosing below a copy of my letter to Senator HART asking that he look into the problem, a copy of a letter from Dr. Tarzwell to me, and a short article from the Washington Star indicating one method now being used in a Massachusetts laboratory to recycle mercury.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADMINISTRATION,
West Kingston, R.I., July 2, 1970.

HON. DAVID R. OBEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. OBEY: Reference is made to your letter in regard to the toxicity of mercury and the effects of the ever-increasing use of mercury and its discharge into our environment. I have read with great interest statements in the *Congressional Record* which you forwarded to me. I feel that you have made a very good summary of the problem. I can contribute a few additional items of information based on our work here.

The study of the toxicity of heavy metals is one of the targets in our program of research on marine life. Among the heavy metals, mercury ranks second only to silver in toxicity to aquatic life. However, mercury is a more insidious poison. It acts in a greater variety of ways. It seems to be more readily absorbed. It is stored and passes on through the food chain. Further, it is apparent that with our modern industrial development, more mercury is being discharged as

a waste to our environment. It is acutely toxic to aquatic life at only a few parts per billion, varying somewhat with local conditions. However, short-term acute bioassays, which report results as exposure to the total concentration of mercury added to the test solution, may be misleading. Mercury is usually discharged in some form of a salt and the mercury salts are rapidly precipitated in the marine environment. Since mercury is rapidly precipitated, the actual amount to which the test organisms are exposed is considerably less than the amount added. Therefore, results showing levels toxic to aquatic life can be deceptively high.

We need long-term constantly renewed flow-through bioassays where the actual content of mercury available to the organisms is constantly monitored in order to determine the toxic levels of this material and maximum concentrations which should not be exceeded. These studies should be carried on over a considerable period with reference not only to the toxicity to individual organisms in their lifetime, but to the long-term effects in the second or third generation and the effects of biological storage and passage through the food chain.

Because mercury is so readily precipitated out, it creates a problem in bottom deposits. Concentrations in bottom deposits can reach much higher levels than occur in the water above them. Organisms living in these deposits, therefore, are in an excellent position to take up and concentrate this material. Therefore, studies should be made of the effects of mercury in bottom materials and its eventual circulation through the food chain and concentration in organisms consumed by aquatic life and man.

Since we do not have a flowing seawater system, our bioassays must be restricted at present largely to short-term acute studies. We have carried on studies of this nature and have tested the toxicity of 32 metals to the killifish, *Fundulus heteroclitus*. In our studies with *Fundulus heteroclitus*, we found that the 96 hr. TL50 was 230 ppb. We express the exposure concentrations as tolerance limits, TL. The 96 hr. TL50 means that concentration of mercury or the toxicant under test at which 50% of the test organisms survive for 96 hrs. However, because mercury is very rapidly precipitated out in seawater, these test organisms were exposed to only a small fraction of this amount. It would be expected, therefore, that the mercury deposits in the bottom materials would be more important in the marine environment than in the freshwater environment. Mercuric chloride can be toxic to fish in soft freshwater at a concentration near 10 ppb. with longer exposure. I am enclosing herewith a paper which we published in 1953 which might be of interest to you. It is entitled "Critical Review on the Toxicity of Industrial Wastes and Their Components to Fish" and deals especially with the metals as salts. You will note that in the presence of sodium chloride in amounts approaching only a fraction of that occurring in seawater, that the toxicity of mercury declines rapidly.

There is a use of mercury and possible sources of pollution which I note you have not covered. It is the use of mercury salts and compounds by hospitals or laboratories in their pathological, histopathological, cytological and other studies. When it became apparent that our laboratory would be using mercury, I suggested that we must develop a method for recovering mercury for reuse. Within a short time, a method for the recovery of this mercury was developed. A copy of this method is enclosed. It is only preliminary, and I am sure much better recovery methods could be developed. However, it does indicate that such recovery can be accomplished. The recovery process was

involved and time-consuming, and our limited staff felt that we could not engage in it. However, the problem was resolved by the use of another fixing method which did not require the use of mercury. Therefore, we have eliminated the problem at this laboratory, but mercury pollution from other laboratories remains an important and undoubtedly an ever-increasing problem.

At that time, I desired very much to determine what was the amount of mercury being discharged to our waterways from all the hospitals and laboratories which are engaged in the preparation and fixing of material for the making of slides in the histopathological, histological and other related work. Of course, as you know, I cannot devise a questionnaire and send it out for this information. I did learn, however, through a technician that one of the hospitals in Providence used at least 150 lbs. of mercury a year. I think it would be very interesting to determine how much mercury is used by the hospitals on an annual basis throughout the year. I am sure the National Institutes of Health must use a great deal of fixing materials in the period of a year. The mercury so used could be recovered or they could change to other fixing materials such as we have at this laboratory. I should also like to add that my comments only apply to histopathologically derived mercury. There are quite conceivably, other laboratories releasing mercury contaminated effluents in this country.

In my opinion, mercury is an insidious poison and those using mercury should make every effort to recover it; they should initiate good housekeeping methods so that mercury is not discharged to the environment; and above all, they should try to find substitutes for mercury which are not toxic, at least not as toxic or more easily controlled than is mercury. Toxicity in the aquatic environment has been a very serious problem to me in my endeavor to determine the adverse effects of wastes and to determine levels which should not be exceeded under long-term exposure. I am very pleased with the interest which you are taking in this problem, and I am sure that our environment will be the better for it.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE M. TARZWELL,

Director.

PROCEDURE FOR REMOVING MERCURY FROM MERCURIC SOLUTIONS AND RECLAIMING MERCURIC CHLORIDE IF DESIRED

Zenker's solution is used in histological laboratories as a fixative for tissue specimens. Because it contains 7% mercuric chloride, its disposal might present a pollution problem. In order to circumvent this problem and cut laboratory costs, a mercury removal and reclaiming procedure was developed.

Among several possible procedures, the following proved to be suitable for routine use in a small to medium size laboratory. The method is based on the insolubility of mercuric sulfide which is formed by the addition of sodium sulfide.¹ Mercuric sulfide can then be converted to mercuric chloride by treatment with aqua regia.²

MATERIALS

1. Na₂S·9H₂O technical grade.
2. Concentrated hydrochloric acid.
3. Concentrated nitric acid.
4. Büchner funnel.
5. Whatman No. 42 filter paper.
6. 75% methanol.

PROCEDURE

100 ml. of a 40% sodium sulfide solution are added to 1 liter of used Zenker's solution or any other solution containing about 7% mercuric chloride in a large beaker. A slight

excess can be added until precipitation is complete. The procedure should be conducted under a hood or in a well ventilated room.

A heavy black precipitate of mercuric sulfide quickly settles to the bottom and the supernatant is discarded. The mercury is now out of solution and can be handled as a solid.

If one wishes to reclaim the mercury as mercuric chloride, the sediment is washed with water and filtered on a Büchner funnel using Whatman No. 42 filter paper until the filtrate is clear. The precipitate is then transferred to a 1 liter beaker and dissolved in 160 ml. of aqua regia made up of 5 parts concentrated HCl and one part nitric acid. Small amounts of free sulfur are removed from solution.

The clear solution is gently boiled down to dryness under a fume hood being careful not to overheat the residue. The dried material is suspended in a minimum amount of 75% alcohol and slowly brought to a boil. After the material is in solution it is cooled at 4° C. until mercuric chloride crystallizes out of solution. The white crystals are filtered on filter paper and dried for use. The filtrate is pooled with the next batch of Zenkers to be reprocessed.

DISCUSSION

Removal of mercury salts from solution is relatively easy and inexpensive with sodium sulfide. The second step of reconverting the sulfide to a chloride is time consuming and expensive. Thus, it is not recommended unless necessary. Mercuric sulfide can be sold to a mercury refining company or disposed of in other ways. It can also be reduced to metallic mercury by heating, remembering that the fumes might be toxic.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., September 10, 1970.

Senator PHILIP HART,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources, and Environment, Senate Commerce Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: I am aware of the hearings which your subcommittee has conducted on the subject of pollution from mercury and other heavy metals. I am hopeful that the information brought out in these hearings will be used to halt this type of pollution as quickly as possible.

It has come to my attention, however, that one source of mercury pollution which has not been dealt with is the possible pollution from hospitals and laboratories which use mercury in the making of slides in histopathological, histological and other laboratory work.

Possible mercury pollution from these sources was first brought to my attention by Dr. Clarence Tarzwell, Director of the National Marine Water Quality Laboratory. In a letter to me, Dr. Tarzwell has said that "mercury pollution from laboratories remains an important and undoubtedly an ever-increasing problem."

I would like to urge that your subcommittee study the possible pollution of our environment from mercury which is used by hospitals and laboratories. And, I would like to urge you also to invite Dr. Tarzwell to testify on this matter before your subcommittee.

I believe Dr. Tarzwell can provide useful information to your subcommittee for two reasons. First, I believe the information which he has on the whole matter of mercury pollution should be made public so that everyone working in this area can benefit from it. Second, Dr. Tarzwell has found an alternative method for the fixing of slides in laboratories which does not require the use of mercury, and this alternative method is now being used in his laboratory.

As one who shares your great concern over the problems of mercury pollution, I am willing to assist you in any way in an effort to come to grips with this problem.

¹ F. Field. J. Chem. Soc. 12:158, 1859.

² J. B. Hannay. J. Chem. Soc. 26:567, 1873.

I am enclosing for your information a detailed letter on mercury pollution from Dr. Tarzwell to me. I am sure it will provide you with some useful information in this area. I also intend to make remarks on this subject on the House floor today which you may find helpful.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID R. OBEY,
Member of Congress.

[From the Evening Star, July 28, 1970]

PROCESS TO SAVE MERCURY FROM WASTE IS DEVELOPED

LAWRENCE, MASS.—A state chemist says he has developed a simple process to screen out 99 percent of the mercury from chemical wastes—and make money too.

Chemist Ray J. Donlan, chief of the water laboratory at the Public Health Department experiment station here, said yesterday the process has been used successfully at the station for more than four months.

Donlan's comments came three days after the U.S. Justice Department announced it will file suits to require 10 companies to end discharges of mercury into navigable lakes and rivers.

Donlan said the process he developed involves placing a few scraps of aluminum into a mercury bearing solution and leaving them there overnight.

The mercury precipitates out and can be recovered and sold, in impure form, for about \$4.50 a pound, he said. Purified, it is worth around \$30 a pound.

Donlan said he thinks "every chemist is aware of the process," but he believes his laboratory is the first to make use of it.

"We discharge our wastes into the Lawrence sewage system, which flows into the Merrimac River, so we thought we should do a little housekeeping ourselves."

Donlan said the Lawrence laboratory began trying the process months ago, long before the discovery of potentially dangerous mercury concentrations in some fish.

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT

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

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing a resolution which would provide for the establishment of a standing Committee on the Environment in the House of Representatives. Since the time I first offered this proposal, in April of 1969, 162 of my colleagues have joined in offering identical resolutions, including the 14 Members whose names appear on the one I am introducing today.

Earlier in this session the House approved of the establishment of a Joint Committee on Environment and Technology. At that time, I stated that the joint committee was a desirable addition to the machinery of Congress. However, I also pointed out that the joint committee should be viewed as merely an interim device. Although this measure has now been placed on the Senate calendar, the other body has yet to take floor action.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we in the House must move ahead now. We must, before the end of the 91st Congress, establish a standing Committee on the Environment so that the House will be

ready to move full speed ahead on the important environmental bills at the outset of the 92d Congress.

Even if the joint committee is established in the near future, it will only have an advisory role. It will not have legislative power; no bills will be referred to it; and it will not report bills to the floor of the House. Yet more and more environmental bills are being introduced every day the House is in session. These bills are referred to various committees of the House. As a result, our approach tends to be fragmented. U.S. News & World Report recently estimated that it would cost \$4.2 billion to solve our solid waste disposal problems, \$13.1 billion to clean up the air, and \$54 billion to clean up the water.

If Congress is going to be responsive to these and the other interrelated problems of environmental quality, I believe it is imperative that one committee, working with the expert assistance of one professional staff, consider all of the necessary legislation in the areas of air pollution, water pollution, solid waste disposal, acoustic problems, weather modification, and the use of pesticides and herbicides. A single standing committee with full legislative powers to deal with these problems would make Congress far more responsible and responsive to the environmental concerns of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the sponsors of the various House resolutions to create a standing Committee on the Environment come from 44 of our States and from each of the standing committees which now serve the House. Members from both sides of the aisle and of widely differing philosophies have joined in this effort. I am confident that I speak for all 163 of us in asking that the Rules Committee hold hearings and report appropriate legislation yet in the 91st Congress.

I am pleased to announce that the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. REIFEL), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES), the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRAY), the gentleman from California (Mr. TUNNEY), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DONOHUE), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LANGEN), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL), the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) have joined myself and 149 other Members of this body in proposing a standing Committee on the Environment.

CURRENT PALESTINIAN GUERRILLA HIJACKINGS

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the hijackings of the Pan American, TWA,

BOAC, Swissair, and El Al flights, and the holdings of some 300 hostages, by the so-called Palestinian guerrillas are not only deplorable, but also despicable. All of us are being asked what we are doing about it and what we plan to do about it. As an individual Member of Congress and particularly as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, this matter is of grave concern to me.

I have long been concerned with the problem of airline hijackings. The committee which I chair has held extensive hearings on this subject. We issued a report—House Report 91-33, 91st Congress, first session, March 11, 1969. About the time of that report—which I would urge you to read—I stated that "we cannot legislate sanity." Most of the hijackings which had then come to our attention were perpetrated by desperate individuals, criminals, lunatics, people of deranged mentalities. The series of hijackings to Cuba in my opinion were not political in nature and the force flights to Havana and the passengers on those flights were safely returned. A number of hijackers have been apprehended, tried, convicted, and sentenced. Some voluntarily returned from Cuba, even though the penalty after conviction of an attempted hijacking under the Federal Aviation Act is a minimum of 20 years and a maximum of death.

Although the current actions of the guerrillas can be properly described as inhuman and even animal-like, unlike most earlier ones involving the United States, they are not the actions of single, desperate, and irrational minds. They have been planned and carried out through concerted actions of many persons.

The executive department, including the White House, the Department of State, the CIA, and the FBI, I am satisfied, have put their very best talents to this challenge. I am sure they are also joined by the Department of Defense, the FAA, and any other offices having a responsibility. I will keep in close touch with their progress and assist in any way that I can.

The actions of the Palestinian guerrillas are violently extreme. We may be required to take extreme or unusual steps in response. We, of course, will have to work to a large part through diplomatic resources and in cooperation with other nations whose citizens have been victimized and whose aircraft have been confiscated.

I do most emphatically want the hostages, their families, everyone in this country, and particularly the forces and the people who have perpetrated this inhumane and totally unacceptable action to know that it cannot persist and must not be duplicated.

VINCENT LOMBARDI

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

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I

want to take a moment to reflect on the recent loss, Wisconsin, our country, and everyone who abides by the love of his fellow man, suffered with the passing of Vincent Lombardi.

This legendary man left a legacy that will last for eternity.

A great football coach, yes. More important, a truly wonderful man filled with insight, dedication, and leadership without peer.

He was admired by all and inspired those who came to learn under his tutelage.

Vince Lombardi made his mark upon our world and achieved successes that will remain as tremendous recollections for all of us.

I wish to join the many friends across the country in expressing sympathy to Mrs. Lombardi and her grieving family.

My prayers go for his everlasting happiness in Heaven.

AIRPLANE HIJACKINGS

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the word community cannot continue to allow itself to be blackmailed and intimidated by international airplane hijackings.

There are a number of nations which share a certain amount of responsibility in this situation. Nations which are doing little if any thing to control those within their borders from these acts of piracy.

It may well be necessary for the International Federation of Airline Pilots Association to declare a boycott of the Arab states and demand that landing rights be refused to those airlines serving Arab countries.

I fully realize the inconvenience that such action may cause to the many who have need to travel to Arab countries. But there is little choice under the present circumstances.

One American-flag aircraft already has been destroyed at the Cairo Airport. Three aircraft, a British, Swiss, and American, are parked on the desert in Jordan and threats have been made to destroy them. But of far greater importance, Mr. Speaker, are the lives and welfare of about 300 airline passengers of many different nationalities who are being held as hostages and who have been threatened with death by the Palestine guerrillas if their demands are not met.

The issue is not racial, religious, or national. The issue is one of decency and humaneness.

The Philadelphia Inquirer this morning contains an article depicting the concern of a number of Philadelphia's citizens and their turning to prayer at this time of crisis.

I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

PHILADELPHIA JEWS RALLY IN PRAYER, DEMAND WORLD HALT PIRACY
(By Andrew Wallace)

Sounding alarms on a ram's horn and chanting in supplication, Jews of Philadelphia began an around-the-clock vigil

Wednesday noon, praying for the safe return of 180 hostages held captive by Palestinian guerrillas.

Even as they began the solemn wait near the Monument to the Six Million Jewish Victims of Nazi Oppression at 17th and the Parkway, they learned that yet another airliner, with its crew and passengers, had fallen prey to the air pirates.

For them the threat was deeply felt and personal. Jerome Kaplan, president of the Greater Philadelphia Council of the American Jewish Congress—who was with his wife and son on the El Al airliner the guerrillas tried to hijack over London on Sunday—was there to tell of the ordeal.

LITTLE IS HEARD

Nearby, Mrs. Sylvia Silovitz and Mrs. Sarah Weisberg, sisters of Rabbi Menachem Raab, whose wife and five children are among the captives, received the sympathy of the 45 Jews who took part in the ceremony.

They have heard little, they admitted, except that the hostages were being fed and are allowed to sometimes leave the plane, stranded in the Jordanian desert, for short periods of time.

Those attending were not critical of the U.S. role in working to free the captives. "They are doing all that is possible," Mrs. Silovitz said.

Officials of Jewish agencies, along with City Councilman George Schwartz, freely expressed their anger at the terrorists and announced plans to try to move the United States to take direct action to halt the wave of hijackings.

PARTNERS IN CRIME?

Schwartz read what he termed the "guts" of a resolution he plans to introduce Thursday in City Council, memorializing Congress and the President and demanding governments and airlines to "declare a boycott of the Arab states and to refuse landing rights to Arab planes and those airlines serving Arab countries."

Failure to do so, he warned, "makes these governments and airlines partners in these criminal acts."

Kaplan said he sent a telegram to President Nixon urging "the immediate cessation of all American commercial flights to any Arab countries which allow plane hijackers to operate from their territory."

"COWARDLY TACTICS"

Theodore R. Mann, president of the Jewish Community Relations Council, sponsor of the vigil, contended the "cowardly barbaric tactics employed by the terrorists must not be tolerated."

Nearby, one man argued that the nation's Jews should immediately march on the White House to demonstrate for more concrete action.

At the fringe of the group was Rabbi Harold Novoseller and a small contingent from the Jewish Defense League, whose leader, Rabbi Meir Kahane, threatened earlier to retaliate in kind to Arab terrorist attacks.

Rabbi Novoseller warned that the terrorists "will suffer the consequences" if harm is done Jews or non-Jews.

"Was it an eye for an eye?" he was asked. "It's two eyes for an eye," he replied.

THE WAVE OF TERRORISM NOW SWEEPING THE WORLD WAS FIRST DESIGNED BY THE SOVIET UNION AT THE TRICONTINENTAL CONGRESS IN HAVANA, CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI), is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the wave of terrorism now sweeping the entire world was first conceived, designed, and developed at the Tricontinental Congress held in Havana, Cuba, on January 2-14, 1966, with more than 600 top Communist leaders from 82 countries on three continents—Asia, Africa, and the Americas, in attendance.

This prophetic meeting, which received practically no attention from the world press at the time, was organized by the Soviet Union. Its main purpose was to draw up a blueprint for a new technique of coordinated Communist aggression by exporting the same kind of subversion and terrorism first developed by the Vietcong in South Vietnam to all of the 82 nations represented in the Congress on the three continents.

Let there be no mistake. The hijacking of aircraft, for kidnappings of diplomatic officials, for assaults on embassies, buildings, and other installations, the burnings and lootings, the subversion against established institutions of government, and the use of terror is not just something that is a coincidental happening throughout the world.

It should be perfectly clear that the trap into which the United States was pulled by the Soviet Union in the Middle East, when we naively agreed to sponsor a cease-fire, is part of the running conspiracy first developed in Havana, Cuba, 4½ years ago, and now being methodically carried out throughout the world.

There must be no doubt that the Soviet Union has engaged in the most violent diplomatic deceit when it misled the United States into believing that somehow, peace can be found in the Middle East through a cease-fire.

The Soviet Union never intended to support the cease-fire and in order to completely wreck it, the Communist-inspired, trained, and armed Palestinian terrorists hijacked four aircraft to create an international crisis.

I believe the time is long past due when the Soviet Ambassador to the United States, Anatoly Dobrynin, should be asked to leave this country, for, indeed, he has been an architect of the most brutal kind of deceit ever practiced in diplomatic circles.

Dobrynin should be declared persona non grata because on two major occasions, he has flagrantly deceived both Secretary of State William Rogers and former Secretary Dean Rusk. Both President Nixon and President Kennedy have been victims of Soviet treachery reflected by Dobrynin.

It was Dobrynin who, in pursuit of the blueprint worked on in Cuba 4½ years ago for world rebellion, subversion, and terrorism—first assured the American State Department that the Soviet Union would support a cease-fire in the Middle East. He helped write the cease-fire order in which the Soviets agreed not to change their military status.

It was not but a few hours after the cease-fire announcement that Soviet technicians were moving SAM 2 and 3 missiles into an offensive position within 15 to 18 miles along the Suez, categorically in violation of the cease-fire

agreement itself. While all this was going on, with U-2 flights dutifully recording this Soviet deceit, Dobrynin was sweet-talking the State Department about the Soviet Union's peaceful intentions.

This was the same Ambassador Dobrynin who engaged in the same kind of violent deceit against President Kennedy in 1962 when he tried to persuade the late President not to believe there were Soviet missiles aimed at the United States, even though our own U-2 reconnaissance flights over Cuba produced indisputable proof of their presence as offensive missiles.

Mr. Speaker, the administration can no longer refuse to face up to the grim realities of Soviet infamy.

We have a right to ask, "Are we again being hoodwinked and bamboozled by Soviet treachery and surrender in the Middle East?"

It will serve no purpose to recall here the infamy of the Soviets in their massacre of 15,000 allied soldiers in the Katyn Forest; or when they triggered off World War II with the infamous Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement; or when they plunged 180 million people from Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria behind the iron curtain after World War II through their false promises at Yalta and Potsdam.

No one in their right mind can afford to ignore the treachery of the Soviets during any of these episodes. They are, above all, a tragic reminder of the scope of Communist hypocrisy and should serve as warnings that we are again witnessing another Munich; this time in the Middle East, with Israel as today's victim of Soviet infamy.

One perhaps could try to understand the imprudent wishfulness of this administration that somehow problems of the world will go away and everything will return to normalcy. But, Mr. Speaker, it is becoming most difficult to understand our President, when it was Mr. Nixon who rose to fame and ultimately the Presidency of the United States, because of his hard line against Soviet deception and intrigue.

What has happened to the Richard Nixon who became the great disciple of warnings against Soviet infamy and why is the President today giving into the obviously bankrupt advice of career people in the State Department, whose record of failures literally paralyzes the sensitivities of man's values.

This Nation has a right to ask what has changed to make Mr. Nixon to believe that some how or other, the Soviet threat is any less today than it was 20 years ago when he sounded the first clarion.

The Soviets have kept the world in a state of constant turmoil since the end of World War II.

First, in their barbaric occupation of the captive nations of Europe; and second, their unbroken record of deceit and intrigue against institutions of freedom, starting with the civil war in Greece, which Communists fomented with the full blessings of the Soviet Union, be-

cause the Soviets wanted access to the Mediterranean, through Korea, through Vietnam, and now the Middle East.

At what point is the administration and the American Nation going to realize the scope of Soviet treachery?

At what point will we realize the Soviet Embassy right here in Washington is the nerve center for terror and subversion in this entire hemisphere.

The United States today stands as a partner in guilt for what is happening in the Middle East because our own government was foolish enough to rely on the deceit of Dobrynin and his government.

The Israelis, most reluctantly, agreed to the cease-fire knowing full well that the Soviets never intended to make good on their pledge.

Mr. Speaker, today it is only the Israelis who truly understand the magnitude of Soviet conspiracy. It is a tragedy of our times that a mighty nation like the United States can be forced to concede to the infamy of Soviet-Arab terrorists, while tiny little Israel, with slightly more than 2 million people, is the only nation courageous enough to stand up to Russia's brutal aggression.

The terrorism that we see in the Middle East today is part of Moscow's grand design to create enough turmoil in the Arab world so that Russia's own Soviet Muslims can move in and take over those countries as similarly Soviet-trained agents took over the captive nations of Europe.

Communism breeds on disunity and this is the Soviet's main weapon in the Middle East.

I said on the floor of this House that Soviet pilots were being used in the Middle East, and that statement was denied.

A few days later, it had to be confirmed in the face of overwhelming evidence.

I said the Soviet Union was recruiting Soviet Muslim from the provinces of Azerbaijan, Tadjistan, Turkman, and other Soviet Republics that contain large elements of Muslim populations in Russia and training them for duty in the Middle East.

This, too, was first denied but is now a proven fact.

The scope of Soviet treachery is best demonstrated by the fact that Moscow is too smart to try to destroy the deep roots of Muslim religion in Arab States by attempting to turn those states Communist. No, the Soviets are too smart for that and know that the long years of history are against such a plot. And so, instead, the Soviets are infiltrating Soviet oriented Muslims, trained in Moscow, and sending them into the Arab states for ultimate take over of those countries.

What an enormous tragedy that Arab leaders cannot understand that achievement of Soviet goals in the Middle East would mean the hammer and sickle would fly above the Kaaba stone in Mecca and the walling wall in Jerusalem, and that Lenin's portrait would appear above the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem.

The United States has not lifted a finger to expose this brutal aggression or against the way the Soviet Union has

methodically rearmed the Arab States to wage war against Israel.

The terrorist organizations now roaming the Middle East—holding hundreds of innocent victims hostages, engaging in most violent sabotage and terrorism—are armed with Soviet weapons.

Where is the voice of outrage by the Soviet Union against these hijackings and terrorism now sweeping the world? Moscow's only comment is that it gives their Arab allies a bad image throughout the world.

It is folly to ask the Soviet Union to join in a denunciation of these tactics when the record now clearly indicates that the Soviet Union itself is masterminding and conducting this orchestration of violence sweeping the world.

Let there be no mistake by the American people and the free world—Russia will not stop this terrorism until the ultimate goal of overthrowing the U.S. Government has been achieved by the architects of the Havana Manifesto which was issued at the conclusion of the Tricontinental Congress.

Even though 600 important Communist leaders from 82 nations of Asia, Africa, and the Americas attended the Tricontinental Congress, it was the Soviet Union who was the chief architect over this grand design for the destruction of freedom.

I warned here on the floor of this Chamber in 1966 of the brutal tactics against freedom that were being developed in Havana. I warned against this wave of terrorism now sweeping the world.

But the sophisticated press chose to ignore these warnings and even the New York Times, which prides itself on being the chronicler of world affairs, gave nothing more than sparse coverage to the Tricontinental Congress.

The rest of the world media literally ignored it.

The Tricontinental Congress met the first 2 weeks of January 1966, in the Havana Hilton Hotel, now called the Havana Libre, which was declared off limits for the public and press.

Leaders of the Congress said their time table called for full-scale terrorism and subversion in the United States and throughout the world by 1970. They said it would take them 4 years to properly train enough guerrilla leaders who would mastermind subversion and terrorism on the three continents represented at the Congress including the United States.

Our Central Intelligence Agency monitored the entire proceedings, and Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely uncanny how closely the time table for terrorism and subversion worked out in Havana is now being carried out throughout the world.

The belligerent tone of the Tricontinental Congress was set by Cuban President Dorticos in his inaugural speech on January 4 when he demanded the "overthrow of the United States."

He proclaimed that "the right as well as the duty of the people was to answer armed violence of imperialism with armed revolutionary violence."

The tone of the entire conference was against the United States and its involvement in defense of South Vietnam.

A number of speeches were made describing in detail terror tactics being tested by the Vietcong in South Vietnam with assurances that if these tactics succeeded against South Vietnam, they should be used in the 82 nations marked for rebellion by the Tricontinental Congress.

A permanent organization was formed at the conclusion of the Congress with headquarters in Havana, Cuba "to unite, coordinate, and impel the revolutionary struggle against North America."

Pedro Medina Silva, chief of the pro-Communist Venezuelan guerrillas, was named as chairman of the permanent organization. The Tricontinental Congress urged increased efforts in preparing cadres for guerrillas and subversive activities.

Our intelligence shows that Fidel Castro has converted many of the obsolete Soviet missile sites, abandoned by the Russians for more modern installations, into guerrilla training camps, and a number of new camps have been constructed.

There are now 43 camps in Cuba equipped to train 10,000 activists a year to be guerrillas and terrorists; experts in sabotage and espionage. The basic training period lasts 4 months with longer periods for special categories.

The main tactics being taught in the 43 camps include sabotage against all Yankee interests throughout the world.

In order to get crowds sufficiently aroused for mob action, heavy emphasis is placed on demonstrations, sit-ins, protest marches, meetings, and broad scale denunciations of American personnel as well as embassies throughout the world.

Kidnaping of American diplomats is considered one of the most effective means of deteriorating American influence abroad.

In the United States, mass murder of policemen is being encouraged as the most effective weapon for a complete breakdown of law enforcement machinery.

When a guerrilla candidate arrives in Havana through secret means, he is carefully questioned on all possible targets in his community for sabotage or subversion.

Castro's fishing fleet, financed by the Soviet Union, is especially useful for bringing guerrillas to Cuba and re-infiltrating them back to their home country after their training.

One of the most frequent routes to Cuba is Mexico.

Throughout the Tricontinental Congress and now in the training centers, it has been clearly apparent that the Soviet Union is not so much interested in inspiring established Communist leaders of the nations participating as it is in providing direct support to new guerrilla leaders.

Soviet support of facilities for training guerrillas in Cuba should open American eyes to the fact that the present wave of terrorism and subversion in America is Soviet-inspired and Soviet-financed.

The Paris publication, *Le Monde*, one of the few newspapers to provide any coverage of the Tricontinental Congress, gave us our best hint why Moscow had chosen at Havana to throw its weight behind guerrillas, rather than behind hardened Communist Party leaders, when its correspondent stated that the Tricontinental Congress "was clearly aimed at getting results in direct action, and more precisely, in armed action."

In other words, Moscow does not want to risk losing its hard corps Communist leaders in subversion and terrorism, so instead it finances guerrilla activities who obviously are expendable to the Communists after their usefulness has run its course.

There is no question in my own mind that much of the terrorism we are witnessing in America today is being exported from Cuba.

There is ample proof that the Black Panthers are being used by Cuban-trained guerrillas in their terror campaigns very much as other organizations are being used in carrying out terror campaigns.

Recently, Huey P. Newton, defense minister of the Black Panthers, told a Cuban publication that his group planned to study terror tactics being taught in Cuba.

He showed particular interest in the revolutionary methods developed by "Che" Guevara, but said his group was also interested in techniques for sabotage developed by Castro, Ho Chi Minh, Mao Tse-tung, and the Angola terrorists in Palestine.

Newton was in Cuba while out on bond awaiting trial in Oakland, Calif.

Newton is only one of thousands of young Americans being indoctrinated in Cuba after the Tricontinental Congress. The stream of activists going to Cuba to harvest sugarcane is yet further proof.

The daily *El Globo* of Rio de Janeiro said editorially:

What took place in Havana was not a conference but a conspiracy reunion, the danger of which is so clear that only a blind person fails to see it. Once more the sinister shadow of subversion begins to cover the continent.

The Brazilian Ambassador to the Organization of American States declared that "except for the Soviet missiles in Cuba, no event threatens more dangerously the territorial and political integrity of our continent."

But, Mr. Speaker, even to this day, a wall of silence continues, and the Communists advance in their bizarre plan for world subversion.

In a page 5 story about the Tricontinental Congress, the *New York Times* stated that "Cuba is to become a center of anti-United States activities in the Western Hemisphere."

On March 26, 1966, the very distinguished *Barrons* magazine observed that a wall of silence has kept most Americans from learning the truth about Havana even though the Tricontinental Congress was momentous news.

Barrons reported:

With monolithic unity worthy of Stalin himself, the leaders of the global communist

conspiracy in effect declared war on the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, nobody wanted to listen in 1966, just as nobody wanted to listen when the first reports of the Katyn massacre were announced in 1944; just as nobody wanted to listen when the Soviet Union methodically pushed 180 million people behind the iron curtain in 1945 and 1946; just as nobody wanted to listen when the Soviet Union proclaimed its first Brezhnev doctrine last year after storming into Czechoslovakia; just as nobody wanted to listen when the Soviet Union moved her fleet into the Mediterranean and started to force the U.S. Sixth Fleet out of those waters; just as nobody wanted to listen when the Soviet Union, with great skill, rearmed all of the Arab states and declared her determination to destroy Israel and drive America out of the Middle East; just as nobody listened when we announced the appearance of Soviet pilots in Egypt; just as nobody has listened as we made clear that the Soviet Union has violated the latest attempt toward a ceasefire in the Middle East by installing offensive missiles along the Suez.

Mr. Speaker, we are at the crossroads of this Nation's very existence. Never has this Nation been more seriously threatened with complete and total isolation from without, and with barbaric terrorism and subversion from within.

Can we marshal the forces of the world to deal effectively with this monstrous assault and conspiracy against freedom?

Will this administration stand up and let the American people know the full, ugly facts of Soviet treachery, and indeed, will we have the courage to document the case against Russia in the forum of world opinion?

All of man's conflicts have been the result of a miscalculation. We Americans must state our case fully so there will be no miscalculation that we will not idly sit by and watch our freedom destroyed by Soviet deceit, treachery, terror, and subversion.

LIBERAL OIL IMPORT QUOTA POLICY WILL ALLEVIATE NEW ENGLAND FUEL CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, as winter approaches, we are being advised daily by stories in the news media of an impending fuel oil crisis that threatens the Northeastern States, and we are receiving complaints from constituents on the spiraling costs of currently available fuel oil.

The impending shortages and increased costs of fuel oil are attributable to varied and complex factors which seem to have coalesced into the prospective Northeast fuel oil crisis for the 1970-71 winter season.

Among these factors are the current Mideast crisis, the Suez Canal blockage, rupture of a crude oil pipeline in Syria, Libyan demand for crude oil price in-

creases, shortages of jumbo tankers for the long journey from the Persian Gulf around Africa's Cape of Good Hope to Atlantic ports, an almost insatiable demand for oil in Europe and North America, and the necessity for low-sulphur content oil to meet the new and stringent American anti-air pollution standards.

The result is that New Englanders are paying a higher price for oil now, and they face the prospect of paying exorbitant and unreasonable prices this winter if, indeed, they can obtain the quantity of oil needed during the coming frigid seasons for the heating of homes, schools, hospitals, institutions, industries, and for the production of electricity.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to avoid an oil crisis this winter, I feel the Government must take action now to relax the stringent oil import quotas and the Defense Department should release some of its reserve and unused quotas for oil imports. Such action would guarantee New Englanders an adequate supply of heating oil and help to force down prices. I have urged the President to consider these actions, and include a copy of my telegram to the White House with my remarks:

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully urge you order Interior Secretary Hickel and Defense Secretary Laird take immediate steps that would assure homeowners and industries in Massachusetts and New England of adequate fuel supplies at reasonable prices during the coming frigid winter season. I suggest this can be accomplished by further liberalizing the mandatory import quotas on No. 2 fuel oil and the emergency release of Defense Department oil quota reserves. Shortages of residual oil and coal supplies has forced industries, institutions, and utilities to seek No. 2 home heating fuel, also in short supply because of Middle East crisis and shortage of jumbo tankers to make long voyage around Cape of Good Hope to East Coast ports due to Suez Canal closure. The Federal Government has the power to relieve the people of Massachusetts and New England of this unjust burden on their comfort and their pocketbooks. The mandatory import controls on home heating oil are artificial and arbitrary. Existing lack of flexibility in their administration serves no legitimate national purpose, but merely constitutes an unjust and inequitable discrimination against millions of Americans in the Northeast. If these proposals are not implemented to alleviate the fuel oil crisis, the alternative will be oil rationing and price controls for New England this winter.

EDWARD P. BOLAND,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I also include with my remarks an editorial published in the September 6, Springfield Sunday Republican entitled "Fuel-Short Region":

FUEL-SHORT REGION

What may have been regarded in the past as a political agitation for lower fuel oil prices in the Northeast has emerged as something quite different. It is, obviously, not political and not a matter of cheaper fuel. The objective is fair treatment for consumers in the New England region, who face a shortage of heating oil at any price.

In the first of three regional hearings by the Governor's Emergency Commission at

Springfield's city hall Thursday, public officials from the western counties colored the fuel picture black. Prices are rising sharply as supplies become scarce, it was reported. Industrial heating oil, on which much of the area's electric power supply depends, is in particularly short supply. Natural gas shortages are a problem for some industries.

But the pressure is also on home heating oil, the price of which has gone up—and which reportedly is being used by some suppliers to thin the heavier industrial oil. The prospect of fuel rationing in the coming winter, to say nothing of power brown-outs, is disturbingly real.

Basically, the problem is a conflict between the interests of the domestic oil producers, who have been supported generally by both the Johnson and Nixon administrations, and the New England states, which have no oil refineries or gas supplies of their own and are remote from the production areas. The cost, and sometimes the inadequacy, of transportation has long been reflected in the high prices New Englanders have had to pay for fuel—and, indirectly, for steam-generated electric power.

Hopes of remedying the price inequity rose a couple of years ago when Occidental Petroleum Corp. announced plans to build a refinery at Machiasport, Me., which would process imported crude oil. But it was necessary for the state of Maine to apply for federal authority to establish a free trade zone in that state to free the imports of customs limitations. Also, the company needed permission, under the federal oil import quota program, to receive shipment of foreign crude oil. Neither application has succeeded.

The entire proposal was fought strenuously by the domestic oil industry, which cited "national security" as one reason to protect the home market against competition from abroad. Another reason was that the development of yet-untapped oil reserves in this country should be encouraged.

While the administration has given lip service to abandonment of the 11-year-old oil import quota system—and indeed seemed ready to replace it with a stepped-up tariff program—the picture changed abruptly in mid-August. The key was the position of the President's oil policy committee, which first recommended replacement of the quota system, then reversed itself—apparently on the strength of "national security" in the light of the Middle East situation.

(The Department of Interior, reporting on a study done for it a year ago, said that with removal of the quotas the United States could store ample oil for emergency purposes at much less cost to the nation than accrues from enforcement of the quotas. The cost to Americans because of the quotas was estimated at \$7 billion to \$8 billion annually.)

For now, the only apparent hope of a fair deal for New England oil users is the pressure that can be brought on Congress and the administration by public groups, such as Gov. Sargent's Emergency Energy Commission and the Massachusetts Consumers' Council, by the region's own U.S. senators and representatives—and by private individuals and organizations throughout the region.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE KINGDOM OF SWAZILAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DIGGS, Mr. Speaker, the Kingdom of Swaziland attained its independence on September 6, 1968, after 70

years of British administration. It is a small landlocked country surrounded by the Republic of South Africa and Portuguese controlled Mozambique, 50 to 60 miles inland from the Indian Ocean. Swaziland is a nonracial constitutional monarchy with a prosperous and growing economy. Its people pride themselves on their colorful cultural traditions and the development of their country as a modern nation. King Sobhuza II has been on the throne for almost 50 years and is much beloved by the people. Swazi-United States relations are excellent, and it is our policy to assist the country wherever possible in its orderly and progressive economic and social development. Having visited Swaziland in August of 1969, I have first-hand knowledge of its problems and promise. As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, House Foreign Affairs, I am pleased to congratulate King Sobhuza II and the Swazi people on the second anniversary of their independence and offer them my good wishes for continued progress and prosperity.

THANK YOU, CAPT. JOHN PRIDDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PREYER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the recent hijackings show us how easily the web of our interrelated technology can be broken by the guerrilla tactics of a few evil men. The hijackings even raise the question of man's capacity to survive his own technology.

In the spreading disorder, in the complicated technology of our world, it is reassuring to find man surviving, not through any great feats of technology, but through acts of simple human character and courage.

An example of this is the conduct of Capt. John Priddy, the pilot of the Pan American 747 jumbo jet which was recently hijacked to Cairo and there destroyed.

I have a special interest in Captain Priddy not just because he is from North Carolina—all of us in North Carolina are proud of that—but because my son was a passenger on the hijacked plane. His life and those of the other 187 passengers literally depended on the skill and steady courage and character of Captain Priddy.

The skill was considerable. He landed the plane, at night, at both Beirut and Cairo without having a flight book for either airport. He negotiated the takeoff of the plane from Beirut from a runway never designed for the huge jumbo jets. All of this, plus 8 to 10 hours of steady flying, was done with a cocked pistol at his head. Yet his voice in his announcements to the passengers never betrayed the least tension or fear but was always confident and reassuring and under perfect control. At Beirut he left the cockpit and strolled the aisles, steadying the passengers.

This perfect control was maintained under the nightmare conditions of the final emergency abandonment of the plane. Almost 200 people scrambled off

the plane in 1½ minutes, in the nighttime, sliding down steep chutes from a height equivalent to a two-story house, to be greeted by automatic weapons fire and tracer bullets streaking the night. When the party led by Captain Priddy reached a bus, the Egyptian driver, whether through terror or design, refused to drive the bus away from the plane to the airport. Captain Priddy took the driver's seat with most passengers lying on the floor of the bus to avoid the gunfire and drove it to safety.

That there has been no major mid-air disaster as a result of hijacking can be credited partly to good luck but mainly to the high level of training given the pilots and crews of our airlines for such emergencies. The stewardesses in this instance once again performed magnificently, as they have in other recent emergencies. Our comedians have created an unfair image of stewardesses in this country as just pretty "coffee, tea, or milk" dolls. But in the crunch they have proved to be made not of plastic but of iron.

Captain Priddy's attractive wife was a passenger. She was taking her first flight on a jumbo jet, observing her husband's office and working conditions like other wives. Her bravery was another steadying force, and at Cairo she took charge of sending messages to the passengers' families.

Captain Priddy summed it all up in his moving farewell talk to the passengers as they were flying back from Rome to America. As well as my son recalls it, he said:

We live in a crazy, violent world and perhaps we have gained a deeper understanding of it because we have come so close up to it. We have learned the importance of working together and the importance of unity. I hope you will mull over the experiences of the past 24 hours in your minds and will always remember what saw us through it. I have been flying for 30 years with Pan Am and can truly say that this is the best group of passengers I have ever had. Thank you for all you did. God bless and God speed.

To you, Captain Priddy, on behalf of your passengers, their parents and relatives and friends, I say as sincerely as I know how: Thank you.

All of us are thinking of those passengers now in the desert of Amman, and their relatives and loved ones, and hoping their Captain Priddys will see them through.

NAVAL AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAM—INTEGRATION BY THE NUMBERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, with rare exception, the military bases in our country are under attack from within and without. The weapon of assault is exploitation of racial differences in the man.

Well-intentioned solutions and efforts by the military bureaucrats and top brass are traditional military. Those in command do not seek the cause—are not

allowed to evaluate the real problem, and consequently pursue as an only solution what they have been trained to do; that is, command and discipline.

Typical of the naive lack of understanding in explosive racial relations in our military forces was the Executive order by President Nixon, ordering the Navy goal of a fully integrated work force. It makes little difference to the top echelon receiving such an order whether its force floats or sinks, fights, or is effective—it must be racially integrated, even if it destroys the morale and esprit de corps of the entire force.

To illustrate the absurdity to which one commander has proliferated his command in order to maintain a good efficiency report—of which racial integration of his command is a priority—I refer to a proposed area directive of the Naval Training Center at Bainbridge, Md.

In the proposal, responsibility for action includes maintaining contact with community-action organizations such as NAACP.

Additionally, under "Needed implementation action" is mentioned training courses "One. Sensitivity training to increase understanding of and empathy for the equal opportunity program."

A brief review of this naval "upward mobility" proposal would suggest that one of the reasons for breakdown in military discipline is that those with the responsibility to command are not given the authority to exercise their leadership positions.

Perhaps those who seek do-gooder solutions to unnatural problems would do well to study the military tragedies of the Russian Army first without officers, then with ideological political leaders and finally with the dual command of a combat leader and a commissar. Or then too, we might remember the problems created in the German Army when Hitler assigned to each Wehrmacht commander an SS or Nazi officer to assure that officers and men were properly indoctrinated in the basic goals of the German Reich.

If our military leaders are not soon given the responsibility of maintaining a first-rate fighting force, regardless of do-gooder wailings and racial differences, who can say how long before someone suggests a member of the NAACP—a whiteman's showcase for control—serve as a staff officer to every command and that the commander not be permitted to speak, write or command until after his orders and operation plans have been reviewed and approved by his staff race indoctrination officer and found free from "racial implications."

At some future date perhaps one of our great national leaders will dare suggest that by separating our troops into units according to race they would not only remove the constant agitation of racial differences but could instill competition and pride where suspicion and unrest now prevail.

There are those of us who served in the military who still feel that the goal of every branch of our military should be first and foremost an effective fight-

ing force. To be otherwise constitutes a deviation from the constitutional mandate to provide and maintain a Navy.

Mr. Speaker, a copy of the Bainbridge consolidated affirmative action program follows my remarks:

NAVAL TRAINING CENTER,
Bainbridge, Md.

COMNTCBAIN/AREACORD instruction
12713.

From: Commander, Naval Training Center,
Bainbridge, Md.

To: Distribution List.

Subj: Bainbridge Consolidated Affirmative
Action Program.

Ref: (a) SecNav Notice 12713 of 9 Mar 1970;
(b) COMNTCBAIN/AREACORD INST
12713.3 of 27 Mar 1970.

Encl: (1) Bainbridge Consolidated Affirma-
tive Action Program.

1. Purpose. To distribute a new Bainbridge
Consolidated Affirmative Action Program.

2. Background. Executive Order 11478, issued by President Nixon on 8 August 1969, called for a revitalization of Affirmative Action Plans designed to assure full realization of equal employment opportunities in the Federal Government. Responding to this and other high level implementing directives, the Department of the Navy promulgated reference (a) which contains the Navy-wide plan of action. This later directive requires the revision of local Affirmative Action Plans consistent with Navy requirements to achieve rapid progress toward the Navy goal of a fully integrated work force.

3. Action. Enclosure (1) outlines the new local plan and indicates action items to achieve progress toward goals discussed in reference (b). Addressees should make every effort to take action on designated items within available funds, ceilings and other resources.

REQUIREMENTS FOR AFFIRMATIVE ACTION UNDER E.O. 11478

I. Organization and resources

A. General Requirement. Sufficient manpower resources to carry out the program must be provided and all commands and other organizational units and all levels within those organizations need to be assigned specific responsibility and authority for EEO. The rolls and interrelationships of the EEO and Personnel Director and staff, line and staff managers and supervisors, unions, and rank-and-file employees must be spelled out.

B. Conditions

1. An organization that is consistent with current EEO program requirements already exists. This includes the Area Coordinator to provide the one Navy approach, and Consolidated EEO Committee with representation from all organizations to assure organizational input to action plans, a Domestic Action Officer who serves as the EEO Coordinator, staff technical advisors on the Civilian Personnel Office staff and counselors for the informal discrimination complaint procedure. These assignments are all on a "collateral duty" basis with no additional manpower resources allocated. Consequently the extra supporting workload (staff studies, statistical data, directives writing, investigations, enforcement, etc.) essentially falls to the staff of the Civilian Personnel Office which is already hard pressed to accomplish its basic job.

2. While the organization is current the directives establishing it and assigning responsibility are not. Several are in existence that should be combined to implement the entire EEO program including organization, responsibilities, goals and action required to accomplish goals.

C. Needed Implementing Action

Formulate an area directive with joint concurrence of all commands through mem-

bership on the CCEO. Directive canceling all others on subject would establish Bainbridge position as unqualified support to Navy policy of a "Fully Integrated Work Force". The directive would assign specific responsibility and authority and define the rolls and interrelationships of the Center Commander as Area Coordinator, Commanding Officers, CCEO, Domestic Action Officer, Director of Civilian Personnel and Counselors (if appropriate). The directive should note that all phases of personnel activity are subject to EEO considerations; that an affirmative action plan will be developed and published as a separate document providing specific goals to be used by all in achieving Navy policy objective, i.e., full integration, in making personnel decisions, such as whom to select for a vacancy, whether to redesign a position for employment at a lower level to permit competition by deprived minorities, where to concentrate leadership resources to motivate and achieve greater participation in training activities that will help develop minorities, etc. Additionally the need for allocation of full time manpower resources to EEO functions should be determined.

D. Responsibility for Action.
Action: Area Directives. Responsibility: CPO—Accomplished. Target Date: March 1970.

Action: Numerical Goals. Responsibility: CPO—Accomplished. Target Date: March 1970.

Action: Full Time Social Objectives Action Officer. Responsibility: Center Commander. Target Date: Fiscal Year 1971.

II. Recruitment

A. General Requirement. Continuing "recruiting relationships" with colleges having mostly minority or women students, and with minority groups and women on other campuses, ought to be established. Similar links might be forged with professional societies and other sources of candidates for technical, professional, and management level positions.

B. Condition. The Bainbridge work force is predominantly clerical with the majority of new hires at GS-2 level. Under the circumstances, recruiting relationships with local high school campuses which are all fully integrated are of primary concern. Continuing links with colleges, professional and technical societies would therefore be redundant. Schools, churches and local minority organizations are kept fully informed of Bainbridge's employment needs on a current and continuous basis. This includes an active local high school contact program to assure that our predominately clerical hiring needs are met. Through this program, every local high school has taken advantage of "on campus" testing for Federal jobs. As a consequence, very adequate clerical registers of eligibles are maintained by the Civil Service Commission, Interagency Board for Maryland.

C. Needed Implementing Action. Recruitment practices are in many ways the foundation of an effective affirmative action program. All recruitment practices should be reviewed to insure that minorities in the recruitment and retention area are on notice regarding job opportunities. As a minimum, review and improve "recruiting relationships" with local high schools, minority organizations including NAACP and churches; develop further the use of minority employees (already on the rolls) in referring minority applicants; and assure that these sources are continuously advised of job openings and filing procedures.

D. Responsibility for Action.
Action: Review and adjust recruiting practices. Responsibility: CCEO/CPO. Target date: Continuing.

Action: Enlist recruitment aid of current minority employees. Responsibility: CPO. Target date: Continuing.

Action: Encourage more Black high school students to follow Business study programs. Responsibility: CPO. Target date: Continuing.

Action: Provide leadership for and participate in community activities that are directly linked to the recruitment of minority workers, i.e., career day, job clinics, work experience programs and guidance seminars. Responsibility: CPO. Target date: Continuing.

Action: Maintain contact with community action organizations such as NAACP, secondary schools, State Employment Service. Such agencies are helpful in locating job applicants, providing general employment information and assistance in completing applications for Federal Employment (SF 171). Responsibility: CPO. Target date: Continuing.

III. Full utilization of the present skills of employees

A. General Requirement. Agencies should survey the existing work force to find underused or unused skills, and put the data in a "skills bank" to match underutilized employees with job openings. They should also insure that job qualifications requirements are realistic in terms of the jobs to be done.

B. Condition. There is no underutilization at Bainbridge. The nature of Bainbridge jobs is generally clerical in the lower pay levels. Because of this, target positions are available to all through the normal operation of the merit promotion program from one rung of the occupational ladder to another. There are some with unused skills but these are not considered underutilized because the skill is not needed at Bainbridge and the employee is unwilling to transfer to another Navy or Government agency where the skill is needed.

C. Needed Implementing Action. None. However, the nature of the work force should be watched for changes in this condition.

D. Responsibility for Action.
Action: Realistic Qualification Requirements. Responsibility: Line Officials/Supervisors/CPO. Target date: Continuing.

IV. Enhancing "upward mobility"

A. General Requirements. Career ladders should be constructed so that underutilized or talented employees can move up. Career counseling and guidance and training for lower graded employees who can benefit, should be provided. So should "active programs to communicate meaningful information."

B. Condition. Again reference is made to the characteristics of the work force and the fact that growth opportunity is limited by its very nature. Regardless, positions have been redesigned to permit entrance at lower "lead-in" levels by minorities and others who would not otherwise be qualified. Subsequent to qualification and performance demonstration such employees receive "career promotions" to the "full performance" level of their position. Thereafter such employees are on their own to compete for other available promotion opportunities. This same approach is used in "blue collar" positions using "shop learner" as the lead-in level. Employees having difficulty qualifying for these reduced "lead-in" levels are given assistance through special on-the-clock coaching and such other assistance as they individually desire thru the on-base Center. This study Center is operated in conjunction with the Cecil County Board of Education, Harford Junior College, Cecil Community College and the University of Maryland. Among the development courses available are Adult Basic Education for those with less than 8 years education, GED preparatory studies and a variety of undergraduate and graduate courses established to meet work force demands.

C. Needed Implementing Action. The "lead-in level"—Shop Learner Program should be

expanded to provide even more opportunity for the undereducated, unskilled and/or inexperienced to be employed in positions that will help provide the foundation for further growth. Several expansion possibilities come to mind, namely (1) further redesign positions already in the "lead-in level" program to provide a greater grade spread such as GS-1 & GS-2 lead-ins for a GS-3 full performance position rather than the current GS-2 only lead-in, (2) use the "Shop Learner" approach thru helper and mechanic limited in the apprenticeable trades rather than limit to a few utility plant operating positions, (3) expand study-center operation to include Cecil VoTech Center or the Harford College VoTech Center to improve training capability for those in craft or vocational training.

In expanding this program, care should be exercised in its administration to assure a balanced intake of trainees and employees already fully qualified for full performance. This will assure continuity of on-the-job training capability and preserve the work force skill level necessary to assure capacity to do assigned work. Some formula for this balance intake might be used such as 1 out of 4 vacancies in any one occupation could be filled by a trainee.

D. Responsibility for Action.
Action: Continue emphasis on position management. Train supervisors in position management to further maximum utilization and development of employee capabilities. Responsibility: Command/PMO. Target date: Continuing.

Action: Encourage and publicize job restructuring actions enabling upward mobility in occupations with concentration of minority employment. Responsibility: Line Officials/Supervisors. Target date: Continuing.

Action: Expand use of the "lead-in level" program. Responsibility: Line Officials/Supervisors. Target date: Continuing.

Action: Expand use of Shop Learner and increase participation of minority employees through motivation. Responsibility: PWO. Target date: Continuing.

Action: Conduct study of possibility of providing vocational training through Cecil Vocational Technical Center to Shop Learners. Responsibility: CPO. Target date: Sept. 1970.

Action: Increase motivation of under-educated to use on-base study center and other growth and development opportunities. Responsibility: Line Officials/Supervisors. Target date: Continuing.

V. Supervisors

A. General Requirement. Management training courses should have EEO coverage. Realistic and fair criteria for evaluating supervision and management performance in the EEO area are to be constructed, and those who performed well by these standards should be rewarded.

B. Condition. Management training courses do include EEO coverage including the "Working Effectively with People" course which is conducted quarterly and "Civilian Personnel Policies and Procedures" which is conducted at least annually.

Criteria for evaluating supervisory effectiveness exists in the form of "Supervisors' Personal Obligations in the EEO Program", Article 713.1A of the Manual of Civilian Personnel Policies and Procedures. However, there is not now a requirement and consequently they have generally not been used to evaluate effectiveness of performance of Bainbridge officials and supervisors. Moreover, there is no record of any Bainbridge supervisor or official having been recognized or rewarded for exceptional performance in the EEO area. On the contrary, it would seem that policy statements, supervisors obligations and extensive management training efforts have had little positive effect. Attitudes toward EEO among most officials and

supervisors at Bainbridge seem passive rather than affirmative. Generally, there seems to be no firm commitment for progress towards the goals or objectives of this National social policy.

C. Needed Implementation Action. EEO coverage included in management training courses discussed in B. above should be dropped and three (3) full courses instituted as follows:

1. Sensitivity training to increase understanding of and empathy for the Equal Opportunity Program.

2. Civil Service Commission EEO Training Course for Supervisors to stress the roll and responsibility of supervisors in EEO under Executive Order 11478.

3. Local EEO Training for Supervisors to outline the Bainbridge plan for Affirmative Action and supervisory performance requirements thereunder.

The "Supervisors Personal Obligation" needs to be revised and reissued as EEO program performance standards to be used with other performance standards in determining the performance effectiveness of officials and supervisors. A specific plan of action needs to be developed and implemented to assure that supervisor effectiveness in the EEO program is determined and used in formal fitness reports or performance ratings. When each official and supervisor is required to answer to the consequences of his EEO performance effectiveness, they will consciously work toward the "full integration" goal of policy. Each must be completely committed and EEO goals and objectives must be a part of every decision having personnel management implications. Nothing less should be acceptable for a satisfactory or better fitness report or performance rating. Of course, those who perform well would be identified for special recognition under such an evaluation system.

D. Responsibility for Action.

Action: Revitalize "Working Effectively with People" Course. Responsibility: Domestic Action Officer. Target date: Sep 1970.

Action: Formulate Sensitivity Training Plans for Supervisors and Management. Responsibility: CPO. Target date: Oct 1970.

Action: Procure services of CSC to train supervisors in their role and responsibility under Executive Order 11478. Responsibility: CPO. Target date: Jan 1971.

Action: Formulate EEO Program performance standards and evaluation plans to assure supervisory EEO effectiveness. Responsibility: CPO. Target date: Feb 1971.

Action: Formulate supervisory course on local Affirmative Action Plan and Supervisory EEO performance requirements. Responsibility: CPO. Target date: Jun 1971.

Action: Formulate plans to recognize special EEO accomplishments. Responsibility: CPO. Target date: Apr 1971.

VI. Liaison with community efforts

A. General Requirement. This includes active support of local open housing efforts, assistance to employees for whom lack of adequate housing is a barrier to getting jobs, cooperation with local officials to improve transportation between work sites and residential areas, cooperation with groups seeking to set up day care centers for children of employees or applicants, and assistance to colleges and high schools to improve the quality of education and to develop criteria "which relate to the requirements of Federal positions."

B. Condition.

1. **Open housing.** Bainbridge is providing more than "support to local efforts." As a DoD activity Bainbridge has played and continues to play a major leadership role through the continuing DoD-wide action program designed to preclude discrimination against DoD personnel in housing as well as public accommodations. Housing is general-

ly not a barrier to getting jobs at Bainbridge. The kind and level of jobs available usually only attract local candidates. However, the occasional transfer from other geographic locations requires vigilance. The fact that the DoD program operates at Bainbridge primarily for military personnel assures its availability for civilians when needed.

2. **Transportation.** No public transportation system exists between Bainbridge as a work site and the multitude of residential areas. While a bus franchise exists, its owners have been unable to operate it profitably. As a consequence car pools and "share-the-ride" schemes are essential. Since these schemes are quite adequate and generally preferred by the work force transportation does not seem to be impediment to EEO goals.

3. **Day Care Centers.** Bainbridge operates its own day care center for children of working mothers. While it is not used extensively by civilian mothers, it is available and used.

4. **Assistance to Colleges and High Schools.** The Bainbridge work force is predominately clerical and consequently has virtually no need for a college program related to the requirements of Bainbridge positions.

High School or less meets adequately the requirements of most positions. An active local high school contact program is maintained and through this program every local high school has taken advantage of "on campus" testing for Federal jobs. As a consequence very adequate clerical registers of eligibles are maintained by the Civil Service Commission IAB for Maryland. Thus far educational inadequacies related to position requirements have not been apparent.

C. Needed Implementing Action. None as long as present level of activity continues. CPO is responsible for recommending new activity at such time current efforts no longer meet needs.

VII. Program evaluation and progress reports

A. General Requirement. A census of minority employees in all grade levels, occupations and organizations should be taken. Results must be assessed and the program evaluated at regular intervals.

B. Condition. Census of minority employees are taken at least annually to determine progress towards EEO program goals. Results are used by management to adjust programs as necessary to assure progress. Census reports are usually accomplished as a result of directives from higher authority which will be discontinued since this date has been computerized. However, these details will generally not be available for individual command use requiring manual means to be continued locally.

C. Needed Implementing Action. Present action seems adequate CCEO may wish to evaluate progress more frequently than annually.

D. Responsibility for Action.

Action: Develop statistics annually at the close of the fiscal year for use by the CCEO as a means to measure progress toward EEO goals and deficiencies in Affirmative Action. Responsibility: CPO. Target date: July 1971.

VIII. Processing discrimination complaints

A. General Requirement. Sufficient numbers of EEO counselors and complaint investigators should be appointed and trained, and organizations should make provisions for disciplinary action where investigation of complaints of discrimination reveals discriminatory action by supervisors.

B. Condition. EEO counselors have been appointed and trained and are operating as part of the complaint processing procedure. Procedures for processing complaints have recently been promulgated and current information is posted on all official bulletin boards.

C. Needed Implementing Action. None. This requirement has been implemented in full. Counselors need the continued support and cooperation by all especially management.

THE C-5 GALAXY NOW OPERATIONAL

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Air Force's C-5 Galaxy is now flying strategic cargo missions into both Europe and the Pacific, including Vietnam.

The aircraft is the newest one in the Air Force inventory and the largest in the world. It is proving to be every bit of the aircraft it was designed to be—a reliable jet transport with a tremendous capability for the movement of heavy and outsized cargo.

The initial Pacific flight was on schedule throughout its 10-day, 21,550-mile mission. It originated at Charleston Air Force Base, S.C., on July 3, and stopped for brief periods at Dover Air Force Base, Del., and Travis Air Force Base, Calif.—where future C-5 squadrons are to be located—before heading into the Pacific.

The C-5 stopped at Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii; Andersen Air Base, Guam; Clark Air Base, Philippine Islands; Cam Ranh Bay, Vietnam; Kadena Air Base, Okinawa; and Yokota Air Base, Japan.

By July 13, when the aircraft returned to Charleston via Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, it had airlifted varying amounts of military cargo between destinations—including 83,000 pounds which was off-loaded in Vietnam. Computed on a cube basis, the 118,000-pound load hauled between Alaska and Charleston would have required the service of about four C-141 Starlifters.

While one of the primary purposes of this first flight was the airlift of opportune cargo, it also provided orientation and training for the ground crews who will fuel, service, and maintain the aircraft during its regular Military Airlift Command operations.

Huge crowds gathered at each of the points where the C-5 touched down in its maiden Pacific flight. More than 100,000 persons inspected the gigantic airplane during that trip despite the fact that in each location the craft was on the ground for minimum time.

It is natural that the aircraft would stimulate interest and pride among servicemen and other Americans at these foreign ports and it is also natural that the C-5 would generate prestige for the United States among the foreign nationals who see it. After all, it requires the area of a football field to park with its 247.8-foot length and its wing span of 223 feet. The cargo compartment alone is 121 feet long, 19 feet wide and 13½ feet high—big enough to park six transcontinental buses. The C-5's tail reaches 65 feet in the air—the equivalent of a six-story building.

The first C-5 flight to Europe, similar in mission to the Pacific trip, departed Charleston on July 24, the same day that

the second operational flight to the Pacific returned. In Europe, the airplane stopped at Rhein Main Air Base, Germany; Lakenheath RAF Station, England; and Torrejon Air Base, Spain. It flew back to the United States on July 28. Once again, the C-5 delivered substantial amounts of cargo as well as giving ground crews in Europe their first chance at what will soon be routine servicing of the huge aircraft.

Military Airlift Command crews on these first historic missions enthusiastically endorsed the aircraft's performance throughout the flights. Each day now, as C-5's log more hours of operation in both the United States and overseas missions, the aircraft is proving it can perform the primary military mission for which it was intended—the safe deployment of outsized and heavy military equipment to any place in the world at jet speeds.

Operational flights will increase in frequency and number of bases served as more C-5's are delivered to the Military Airlift Command. And, in the meantime, rigorous tests of the C-5 continue by Lockheed Aircraft Corp., and by the Air Force—tests to prove and improve the systems and procedures—tests to give the United States the best end product. I believe these tests and the operational missions being flown by Gen. Jack J. Catton's fine MAC crews will also serve to dispel much of the criticism which has been directed toward this new aircraft.

In its deployment role, the C-5 will be teamed with the highly efficient C-141 Starlifters. Together, the pair will give the United States an unprecedented strategic airlift capability with the C-141's carrying combat ready troops and small vehicles while the C-5's transport the massive, outsized equipment of an Army division.

The C-5 is designed to airlift 220,000 pounds payload under emergency conditions and can load and off-load in a matter of minutes through its visor-nose front and rear ramp. In fact, it can load and off-load simultaneously. Seventeen C-5's could have done the 10-mile work of the 318 aircraft used daily during the Berlin Airlift.

When the 81 C-5's are in the Air Force inventory, the U.S. strategic airlift posture will be 10 times its 1961 capability. However, even with this impressive increase, a deficit still will exist in our ability to meet certain emergency contingency plans for this decade.

The C-5 touched down at Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Ill., on August 18 on an operational mission to pick up a C-5 simulator for the training of pilots. The simulator is a duplicate of the cockpit of the C-5. It is outsized cargo of the type only a C-5 can carry. Previously such cargo could be handled only by ground transportation.

ST. LOUIS BANK REDUCES PRIME RATE; PRESIDENT NIXON SHOULD JOIN PLEA TO OTHER BANKS FOR LOWER INTEREST RATES

(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, yesterday I urged the banking community to face up to its responsibilities to the American public and reduce the prime lending rate to at least 6 percent.

Late last night, I received a telegram from the president of the Southwest Bank of St. Louis announcing an immediate reduction in its prime lending from 8 to 7½ percent.

While this reduction falls far short of what is needed, I commend the Southwest Bank of St. Louis for responding so quickly to the call for lower interest rates. I hope that the example of this bank will set off a chain reaction throughout the banking community and that the big banks in New York, Chicago, and San Francisco will be announcing similar reductions in the next few days.

Many of the big banks are embarrassed to concede the bad mistake that they made in late 1968 and early 1969 when the prime rate was raised six times. I hope that this embarrassment will not prevent the big banks from doing what is right. With unemployment rising well above 5 percent, the economy is desperately in need of a sharp and lasting reduction in interest rates.

The stock market, which has suffered massive losses during this high interest period, also desperately needs a prolonged period of lower interest rates. In hopes that Chase Manhattan and other banks would respond to the pleas for lower interest rates, the stock market conducted a brief rally yesterday. That rally was a firm indication of the need and the strong desire for lower interest rates. It was a strong indication that only lower interest rates will restore confidence in the stock market.

Yesterday, I wrote David Rockefeller, chairman of the board of Chase Manhattan National Bank, urging him to use his leadership among the money center bankers to restore sanity to the economy. I have not yet heard from Mr. Rockefeller but in the interest of the American consumer and the entire economy, I hope that this New York banker is giving serious consideration to the request.

Once again, I commend Southwest Bank of St. Louis for moving quickly to reduce its interest rates. Undoubtedly, this bank, along with others across the Nation, will be able to further reduce rates if Chase Manhattan, Bank of America, First National City, Continental Illinois, and similar giants of the banking industry reduce their rates.

Mr. Speaker, let me emphasize that economic conditions call for a reduction of the prime rate to at least the 6-percent level existing the day that President Nixon was elected. This is a fair benchmark and it is one that I hope both the banks and the Nixon administration will support. Later, I am sure that we can move toward even lower interest rates.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am also calling on President Nixon and Secretary of the Treasury David Kennedy to step forward and join my call for a reduction in the prime interest rate. The decision is hanging in the balance in the boardrooms of the large banks all over the Nation. A slight nudge from the President and his immediate economic advisers can bring

the American people lower interest rates.

In making this plea to the President and the Secretary of the Treasury, I want to submit the President's Council of Economic Advisers' own inflation alert report as supporting evidence. Time after time, this report, issued on August 7, cites high-interest rates as a contributing cause to various price increases.

Speaking of rising costs in manufacturing, the report says:

The largest rises were recorded in net interest. Increases in interest costs and capital consumption allocation occurred in virtually every industry.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that economic conditions will allow for at least a two-point reduction in the prime interest rate. And there is no justification for a delay in this downward push to interest rates. The President has the full authority and certainly, the highest responsibility, to bring to bear the influence of his office to urge the banks to take this very necessary step.

In urging the big banks to come around on the interest rate question, the President is in a position to point out to the bankers that the Congress has given him, in Public Law 91-151, standby credit controls. The President can point out that he is in a position to trigger this authority if the big banks persist in their current profit binge. The proper use of this standby authority could bring about whatever rollback the President would desire.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that no bank or bank apologist will come forward with the idea that interest rates must be kept up to maintain a high level of profits. The banks have enjoyed fantastic profits during the interest rate binges of 1969 and 1970 and there is every evidence of further sharp increases in bank earnings. The Journal of Commerce, which follows bank earnings closely, published a detailed analysis of the bank profit figures on Tuesday, September 8. I place a copy of this article "Sharp Gains in Big Bank Profits Loom" in the RECORD:

SHARP GAINS IN BIG BANK PROFITS LOOM

(By Ed Tyng)

When statements of the country's major banks roll out for the quarter ending this month they will show for the quarter and the nine months ending Sept. 30 a huge expansion in deposits—out of which banks make loans and investments—and a big improvement in bank earnings as a result of more investments but, more particularly, interest savings through repayment of expensive Eurodollar borrowings.

All this will reflect the beneficent influence upon banks of the expansionary Federal Reserve policy which last Feb. 10 replaced a tight and restrictive policy.

By removing interest ceiling limits on bank issues of certificates of deposit maturing in 89 days or less last June the Federal Reserve Board gave the banks an immediate opportunity to bid for vast sums of time deposits at interest rates which ranged down recently to below 7 per cent. Also, since June, through open market operations, the Federal Reserve created large additions to bank demand deposits by buying \$2.5 billion of government securities.

BIG DEPOSIT GAINS

Since the banks were allowed unrestricted sale of certificates of deposit in June volume of certificates issues by all the country's large commercial banks has risen more than \$7

billion to a total of \$20.1 billion, which is double the \$11 billion they had outstanding Dec. 31.

The increase in certificates was mainly responsible for a gain in total time deposits since June of \$10 billion and a gain in that item since the end of 1969 of over \$13 billion. Demand deposits of all large banks have changed little since June and are down about \$20 billion from the end of last year. Total deposits are up \$10 billion since June but are still \$7 billion below the total of last year end, a period in which deposits normally are at seasonal peaks.

EARNING ASSETS RISE

When banks sell certificates of deposit, buyers of them usually draw down demand deposits to pay for them, which tends to deflate demand deposits. These, however, are replenished both by Federal Reserve open market operations and by new loans and investments banks make.

At a recent date total earning assets—loans and investments—of all the country's large commercial banks showed an increase of over \$6 billion from June 24 levels and an increase of about \$2.5 billion since the end of last year. The principal increase was in investments, since bank lending has been on a plateau since June and is actually below the level of last December on an unadjusted basis. Most of the increase in investments has been in government securities, thereby restoring bank liquidity, but so far this year banks have also made substantial additions to their holdings of tax exempt securities.

PAYING OFF EURODOLLARS

At a recent date (Aug. 19) all large commercial banks had reduced their borrowings of Eurodollars from foreign branches by \$1.4 billion since June and by \$1.8 billion since last December. In this period the cost of the Eurodollars has declined to 8 percent from a range of 10 to 11 per cent. The 7 per cent cost of certificates of deposit, out of which most of the Eurodollar payments have been made, has resulted in substantial savings of interest paid by the banks for the money they lend or invest.

Despite the large payoffs of Eurodollars all large banks still owe \$11.2 billion to their foreign branches. Meanwhile the foreign branches have continued to build up their own deposits to new records and while they have less demand for them by their head offices, they are able to employ the funds profitably in making Eurodollar (or other currency) loans to European borrowers, notable in recent weeks to German bank customers.

EFFECT ON PROFITS

It is the combination of employment of more funds in earning assets, and the saving of interest costs on money previously borrowed at high cost, that is going to result in a considerable turn for the better in bank profits during the current quarter, as contrasted with the more dismal earnings previously reported for the second 1970 quarter and the six months then ended.

It is too early to estimate how much profits for the third quarter will exceed those of earlier this year but the experts are guessing that for the nine months ended Sept. 30 profits after security losses will run somewhere around 8 per cent greater than in the like 1969 period. For the first half of this year many large banks reported profit gains over the year before of as little as 5 per cent and a few banks actually showed a decrease as compared with last year.

The profit trend could be adversely affected by a cut in the banks' prime lending rate to 7½ from 8 per cent, but if it should come it will be too late to affect materially current quarter earnings.

In a related development the bank stock firm of Keefe, Bruyette & Woods, Inc. last

week distributed a monumental "Bank Stock Manual" which analyzed the banking industry in depth, while, providing a historical record of virtually all facets of the banking industry. Included in the manual was an analysis which showed that bank stocks over the 10 years 1959 outperformed most other stocks as investments.

For example in the 10 years the Keefe bank index showed a 99.5 per cent earnings gain as against 66.2 per cent for Dow Jones industrials and 79.7 per cent for Dow Jones utility stocks; the gain in dividends was 95 per cent for banks against 63.5 for industrials and 69.7 per cent for utilities. Average price earnings ratios were lower for banks than for the other two groups of stocks.

As to market record the per cent of appreciation (mean prices) was 93 per cent for the Keefe bank stock index against 41 per cent for Dow Jones industrials and 37 per cent for Dow Jones utilities. The Keefe, Bruyette & Woods compendium also contains numerous charts and tables covering the banking business.

Mr. Speaker, I also place in the RECORD the text of the telegram from the Southwest Bank of St. Louis and my letter to David Rockefeller, chairman of the board, Chase Manhattan National Bank:

SEPTEMBER 9, 1970.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Southwest Bank of St. Louis has reduced its prime rate from 8 to 7½ per cent effective immediately. This is Southwest Banks second reduction in prime rate this year. In March the bank was the first in the middle west to reduce its rate from 8½ to 8 per cent. We believe this reduction is in line with the recent trend in interest rates. Southwest Bank has assets of approximately 67 million and is 9th largest in the city of St. Louis.

I. A. LONG,
President.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 9, 1970.

Mr. DAVID ROCKEFELLER,
Chairman of the Board, The Chase Manhattan Bank, New York, N.Y.

DEAR Mr. ROCKEFELLER: As you know, several small banks have announced a minor decrease in the prime interest rate in recent days. For these banks, the prime rate now stands at 7½%, one-half of a per cent below the prime lending rate of the nation's largest commercial banks.

These reductions are encouraging, but they are far too small to have any real impact on economic conditions. More importantly, none of the large banks have followed the lead of the smaller institutions and this fact alone prevents any improvement in economic conditions nationwide.

Mr. Rockefeller, you are regarded as a leader in the banking community and your statements carry great weight with your colleagues among the money center banks. Therefore, I am calling on you and your bank to lead the way to a sizeable and meaningful reduction of the prime lending rate. Just as many of the banks have followed Chase Manhattan's lead in raising interest rates, I am sure they would follow your action in establishing a reasonable prime rate.

For some reason, the large banks went on what I consider an unnecessary and highly unfortunate interest rate binge after the election of President Nixon in 1968.

I am sure that the banking community, in its private meetings, now realizes that it went too far with these interest rate increases in late 1968 and the early months of 1969. The

results of this unfortunate profit-taking are seen in many places in the economy today, most notably, in a sharply depressed housing market and in the unemployment figures which have now soared above 5%.

Economic conditions cry out for a sharp rollback of interest rates and I think it is only fair that the initial point of this rollback be at 6%—the rate in existence at the time of the election of President Nixon in 1968. This would mean that each of the six prime rate increases recorded from November, 1968, to June 1969, would be rolled back. From this point, we could begin to return to economic sanity and to bring about conditions which would allow an even further reduction of interest rates.

There is no reason for a delay in reducing interest rates and I think it is important that this be taken care of well in advance of the upcoming general election in November. Many banks around the country and their top officials are participating in various fund-raising efforts for political candidates, and it would be unfortunate if the bankers' political action somehow became involved in basic decisions concerning the level of interest rates. The decision to sharply reduce the prime lending rate should be made for the good of the economy and not for any political reasons on the eve of national elections.

Mr. Rockefeller, you can do the nation a great service by an immediate move to reduce your bank's prime lending rate to 6%.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

OVERSEAS CREDIT UNION MILESTONE—A TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN MINISH

(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, at the end of July, the military credit unions operating overseas passed two 100,000 milestones. In less than 2 years, the credit unions had signed up more than 100,000 members and had made loans of more than \$100 million.

Both of these are indeed impressive figures and are a tribute to the hard work of Congressman JOSEPH MINISH, of New Jersey.

Congressman MINISH was the head of a special subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee which visited major military installations in the European and Pacific commands on several occasions to press for the establishment of the credit unions. Prior to Congressman MINISH's efforts, servicemen stationed abroad were at the mercy of the money lenders who were able to extort interest rates as high as 60 and 70 percent. In addition, our gold flow problem was hindered because servicemen, for the most part, had to borrow from foreign-controlled loan and finance companies.

The first overseas credit unions were opened in Germany in late 1967, and, from there, credit unions were opened in England, Italy, Korea, and the Philippines. Overnight these credit unions were a success. Servicemen who had been paying interest rates as high as 70 percent for loans were now able to obtain loans as low as 9 percent and loans were made from the lowest ranking enlisted man to officers of the highest rank. The credit

unions forced the loan shark and the fast-buck operators to close their doors. And, for the first time, our servicemen overseas were not treated as second-class citizens in their financial dealings.

Mr. Speaker, a great deal of credit for the success of the overseas credit unions must go to the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. MINISH, who worked long and hard to expose the fraudulent operators who were bilking servicemen and then to fight for the establishment of credit unions as the answer to the problem. There were many obstacles placed in his path and much redtape to be cut through. In many countries, it required detailed diplomatic negotiations before the credit unions could be established. In other situations, it required long hours of convincing skeptical officials that the credit unions could survive. But, throughout the fight, Congressman MINISH held fast in his belief that the credit unions would not only hold their own, but would become an important part of the serviceman's life. The success of the credit unions has borne out Congressman MINISH's foresightedness and has rewarded his efforts.

The work of Congressman MINISH in this important area has received far too little attention for, I think, he has performed one of the greatest services imaginable to our men and women in uniform, and as the overseas credit unions reach for their second 100,000 members and second \$100 million in loans, I salute Congressman JOE MINISH for his efforts.

HIGHWAY SAFETY NOS. 9 AND 10— LAST OF A SERIES

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the two concluding articles in the Christian Science Monitor series on highway safety were published while the House of Representatives was in recess. As I did with the first eight articles in the series, I today will insert them into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The ninth article was a penetrating discussion of the role of the liquor industry in the causation and solution of this national problem. The central point is one which ought to be remembered by legislators as they debate changes necessary to lower the automobile death toll, that the liquor industry bears partial responsibility for the current carnage on our highways and is not a disinterested party. Some of the necessary changes in our laws may, of course, concern the industry, but this is something which must be accepted so that America's highways can become safe for our wives and children, for our neighbors and friends, and for us, too. The liquor industry is not entirely an innocent party which may be harmed by these changes in our laws. Rather it is and must continue to be a regulated industry, so that the damage done by alcohol and by alcoholics can be limited.

The 10th article in this series has a shocking opening sentence:

Since this series began 10 weeks ago, drunken drivers have killed 5,000 Americans. And the toll continues, perhaps at 75 persons a day.

How many of us have had a friend or family member killed by these drunk drivers, who because of lax laws seem to be almost licensed to kill?

Mr. Speaker, my purpose in inserting this series of articles into the RECORD was to focus needed attention on the terrible carnage on our highways, including at least 28,000 who have been killed by drunk drivers. Every year such drivers cause over 800,000 accidents which result in economic loss of over \$8 billion. Yet this intolerable situation is the subject of disturbing apathy, so that steps which would cut this slaughter drastically are just not being taken.

My mail suggests that some people have been listening, which is a hopeful sign. People are awakening, if slowly. Let us demand action.

The last two articles of the series follow:

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
Aug. 20, 1970]

LIQUOR INDUSTRY PLAYS DR. JEKYLL AND MR. HYDE

(By Guy Halverson)

CHICAGO.—Imagine, if you will, the following hypothetical situation: A well-dressed man enters a tavern and consumes a number of drinks. The hours tick away. Though the bartender knows the man has had far too many drinks to drive safely, he can also see that the person is one who "holds his liquor" without any overly evident sign of intoxication.

Soon the man leaves. The bartender hears him roar off in an automobile.

Within minutes, the man has smashed head-on into another automobile.

Unfortunately, this incident is not really so imaginary. According to former alcoholics, many of them now key leaders in Alcoholics Anonymous, as well as the leaders of state police forces, it is a common occurrence. The files of state liquor-control boards, in fact, are jammed with records of tavern keepers who have oversold customers later involved in serious road tragedies.

More important, the illustration raises a number of nagging questions about the role of the liquor industry in society, and also about public policy and responsibility in general.

NECESSARY STEPS NOT TAKEN

The fact is that the liquor industry—and here that includes the bottling and brewing corporations, the distributors, the advertising and sales agencies, the retail outlets—is not yet taking the steps necessary to help stop the drunken driver. These could include unequivocal support on the state level of stiff presumptive blood-alcohol levels.

In fact, despite heavy expenditures in alcoholism research through university grants during the past decades, as well as a recent spate of magazine advertisements by the industry declaring its intention to help rid the highways of drunken drivers, the industry's role, some feel, has been lukewarm at best and perhaps even somewhat dangerously misleading.

Liquor lobbyists are active behind the scenes in every state legislature in the nation, utilizing high-powered law offices and public-relations firms. They are coolly efficient, skilled political tacticians and lavishly financed.

Many experts hold that there is a need for dispassionate, analytical studies of the correlation between liquor sales and per capita consumption and highway accident rates.

Such information is needed to guide state legislators in setting realistic tavern and cocktail bar hours and liquor-license policies. Emotionalism, either against or for liquor sales on a totally unrestricted basis, cannot be tolerated when the highways are being turned into battlegrounds, they say.

ECONOMIC—AND POLITICAL—WEIGHT

This article clearly is not concerned with the long-standing dispute between "drys" and "wets" in the United States. Nor is it a plea for abstinence as such. Rather, it is concerned solely with those policies of the liquor industry that directly touch on highway safety—and which, in all fairness, have to be questioned if the problem is to be meaningfully resolved.

The liquor industry in the United States is an economic giant. Many a longtime newsmen, particularly at the state level, would also say a sort of political giant as well. The industry, with an employment of about 1.8 million workers, grossed more than \$21 billion in 1969 and paid out more than \$8.2 billion in taxes. More than half of this went to the federal government.

The industry is also one of this nation's most important advertisers, spending more than \$200 million annually—some \$88 million of that going to magazines last year.

SUPPORT FOR U.S. DRIVE AVOWED

And now that cigarette advertising is being forced from the television screen, it is known that some broadcasting officials are casting hungry eyes at liquor advertising as possible new revenue sources. In addition, the liquor industry's many ties with the entertainment industry further its ability to reach the public in almost countless ways with a favorable public image.

On the national level, the industry avows its support for the Department of Transportation's new campaign to curb the drinking driver.

"What is our stand on the issue of drinking and driving?" asked a recent full-page Time and Newsweek ad purchased by the Licensed Beverage Industries, Inc. "It's the same as the National Safety Council and the American Medical Association." Industry spokesmen have stressed that the industry's position—like that of the NSC, the AMA, and the Department of Transportation—is twofold: getting the chronic alcoholic, who constitutes perhaps the largest part of the accident problem, off the highways, while also supporting educational campaigns to acquaint social drinkers with "safe" drinking limits.

Get down to the state level, however, where antidrunken-driver legislation—such as implied-consent statutes and presumptive levels—is enacted, and the picture clouds considerably. In fact, one invariably finds that the industry is quiescent (not supporting such measures at all) or actively in opposition.

"LET'S ENFORCE EXISTING LAWS"

Take Michigan, for example. Safety advocates there have been trying to lower the state's presumptive blood-alcohol level from .15 percent to .10 percent. The Michigan Licensed Beverage Association (LBA) is against the bill. "We say the state has enough laws now," argue Eddie Shepherd, coordinator of activities for the Michigan LBA. "Let's enforce the existing laws."

He adds: "Most accidents occur on roads within 25 miles of a person's home anyway. The answer is obviously diverting some of those Interstate-highway funds to secondary roads and arterials."

And the Michigan LBA's coolness to the .10 percent presumptive level, it must be said, is hardly unique.

The lack of clear-cut specific industry support for the federal .10 percent standard and implied-consent laws, say some critics of the industry, is only one part of its dubi-

ous role in stopping the problem of the drinking driver. Perhaps more important, they say, are certain industry practices and objectives that taken together almost ensure accidents.

Such practices, say these critics, include an industry drive to:

1. Increase across-the-board and per capita sales (per capita consumption on the national average has increased little over the past few years).

2. Expand Sunday sales (16 states do not allow such sales).

3. Lower the legal drinking age wherever possible. (Five states currently authorize sales of distilled spirits to persons under age 21, while 16 states allow sales of beer to persons under 21.)

Since the early 1960's, the State of Iowa has kept close records on liquor sales and highway accidents. The results are not pleasant. They strongly suggest, in fact, that increased sales and per capita consumption are followed by increased accident rates.

Most liquor-industry officials insist, however, that enactment of by-the-drink statutes does not lead to increased alcohol-related highway fatalities.

During the decade of the 1960's, drunken drivers killed more than 3,800 motorists on Iowa highways. But that is only part of the story.

"LIQUOR BY THE DRINK" IN 1963

On July 4, 1963, Iowa went to "liquor by the drink," whereby drinks could be sold across a bar, in a cocktail lounge, or club. Prior to that, liquor had been sold only in state liquor stores. During the 1960-63 period, before liquor by the drink, annual consumption averaged .73 gallons per person. By 1964, after liquor by the drink, the figure had risen to .86 gallons per person. And by 1969, it was 1.09 gallons—nearly a 60 percent increase over the 1960-63 average.

And of course, even though Iowa's consumption must be considered moderate on a national level—compared with the 1969 national per capita consumption of 1.81 gallons, the significant fact is that Iowa has shown a steady increase in consumption.

But so, too, have accident rates in that state.

According to studies undertaken by Preferred Risk Mutual Insurance Company, headquartered in Des Moines, fatalities increased 35 percent during the three years after legalization of liquor by the drink, compared with the three years before liquor by the drink. Population increase and vehicle registration stayed fairly constant. During this same period there had been a 32 percent increase in liquor sales.

Another way to measure what happened after liquor by the drink—with its attendant increased sales and consumption in Iowa—is to look at what didn't happen in neighboring Kansas. Kansas is one of a small number of states still without liquor by the drink (though voters will be asked to vote on the issue at the polls in November in both Kansas and Texas).

RATES OF INCREASE CONTRASTED

According to William N. Plymat, board chairman of Preferred Risk, the mileage death rate in Iowa increased 33 percent in the six years after liquor by the drink compared to the three years before. In Kansas without liquor by the drink, the mileage death-rate increase was only about 2 percent.

Studies by Preferred Risk also suggest that fatality rates are higher in areas with Sunday sales than in areas without Sunday sales. Take a comparison of Oregon and Washington states in the years 1965-68. Oregon had Sunday sales. Washington did not.

During the period, almost as many drivers were killed on Oregon highways on Sundays

as on Saturdays: 314 persons were killed on Saturdays; 311 on Sundays.

In Washington, on the other hand, the difference was quite distinct. During those years, 437 people were killed on Saturdays when liquor sales were allowed. But on Sundays, when liquor sales were not allowed, 327 persons were killed.

The difference: 110 persons.

Researchers say that much still remains to be discovered about the effects of drinking on driver behavior patterns. A research program at the University of Vermont, funded in part by the Department of Transportation, is in fact testing such effects with a sophisticated new electronic device.

Some safety experts admit unease at the recent advertisements by the licensed-beverage industries, which they feel might encourage drinking and driving.

The recent advertisements, for example, carry a small "legal limits" chart prepared by the Rutgers University Center of Alcohol Studies in the lower right-hand corner. The chart shows how long a person must wait after certain numbers of drinks to be safely within legal presumptive levels in most states.

The chart, geared to .10 percent levels and above, indicates that a 160-pound man could consume three 1½-ounce drinks and then immediately drive.

WHAT CHART DOESN'T SAY

What the chart doesn't say, critics argue, is that the man may not be fit to drive safely, even though he is within legal presumptive limits; that different drinkers react differently to liquor; and that a novice drinker, for example, may be a deadly highway menace after three drinks. Or a tired drinker. Or an angry drinker. Or a hungry drinker.

A new guide recently issued by the National Safety Council is more realistic, it is felt. The guide says: "If you are going to drive, it would be better if you didn't drink anything at all. Or . . . drinking in such a manner that you will not be under the influence when you drive a car . . . if you choose the second, wait at least one hour per average drink before driving."

The AMA is known to be quite unhappy with the current advertising campaign of the Licensed Beverage Industries, Inc.—particularly its use of the Rutgers chart—which is not a "safety drinking level chart" but rather a legal-limits chart.

Says one of this nation's foremost highway specialists: "This type of [liquor industry] campaign could be disastrous. Would you want a tired motorist hurtling along the highway at 80 miles an hour toward your family after three stiff martinis?"

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 27, 1970]

DRUNKEN DRIVERS ASSAULT PUBLIC'S RIGHT-OF-WAY

(By Guy Halverson)

NEW YORK.—Since this series began 10 weeks ago, drunken drivers have killed 5,000 Americans. And the toll continues, perhaps at 75 persons a day.

Even a passing familiarity with the scope of the continuing tragedy makes one wonder how this nation—this informed, modern society—can possibly tolerate the conditions that cause it. For these deaths are not just statistics. These people are our families, our children, our friends, the neighbors who live on our streets, our classmates from high school and college, our associates at work.

It is an assault on our individual freedom, our right to move freely on the highways and through our cities and suburbs with a sense of confidence and dominion.

MORE THAN SKIRMISHES

"Twice as many people are being killed— you might say murdered—on a yearly basis

by drivers who have had too much to drink as by all of the street criminals, impassioned spouses, and angry neighbors in the country," says Rep. James C. Cleveland (R) of New Hampshire. This member of the House Public Works Committee, which in part oversees highway safety, asks: "Where is our concern, where are our aroused citizens? Where is the indignation which the news media have for so many other causes? We are in the midst of a bloodbath and yet so few seem to care."

We can in fact stop the drunken driver, given our existing knowledge and technology, safety experts insist. We can begin now, but we must want to. The apathy must end.

Those already involved—the police, safety councils, government, concerned citizens' groups, and others—are fighting nothing less than a full-scale battle on our highways. But battles are not won through skirmishes. What's needed is a centralized, interagency attack, wherein all the specialists on alcoholism and highway safety join a systematic, direct attack.

Law enforcement, while basic, is not going to be enough. Drinking drivers fall into different groups which require different rehabilitative approaches. Distinctions must be made between chronic alcoholics, problem drinkers, novice drinkers, social drinkers, and occasional drinkers. And specific countermeasures must then be applied to these different groups.

U.S. PROGRAM A BEGINNING

The United States Department of Transportation's new alcohol countermeasures program—geared in great measure to an identification and control of the "problem drinker"—is an important first step. In many ways the program can even be called a heroic effort. Acting on a limited budget with small staff (fewer than 10), the program is seeking to roll back years of inattention and neglect. At present the \$18 million program encompasses demonstration grants in some nine places around the United States. It is hoped that Congress will fund an additional 20 grants next year.

Yet even this small beginning is not enough. The economic cost of the problem alone amounts to \$8 billion to \$10 billion a year in the U.S. Without total commitment from the highest levels of the federal government, the countermeasures program may well turn out to be only a stopgap.

ONE ASPECT LACKS DATA

Nor should the problem of the driving social drinker be overlooked, though this seems to be happening. It is known that the problem drinker is responsible for perhaps the largest chunk of all fatal accidents. Researchers do not yet precisely know how many liquor-related fatalities on the highways are caused, on the other hand, by social drinkers.

Researchers do tell us that their role in fatal accidents is relatively small. But it would be foolish to ignore the problem. It takes only one accident.

Enforcement, however, is the crux. It was high atop a Colorado mountain peak, recently, with the magnificent Sangre de Cristo range directly opposite me, that I saw that clearly. My host was Prof. Robert F. Borkenstein, a gentle, articulate scholar-inventor, now in his fourth decade of police-science work. We must make the "drinking-driver public" more aware of the "reasonable likelihood" of arrest, argued Professor Borkenstein. "It isn't just a fear of punishment that is important. It's a reasonable assumption of apprehension. It's the inconvenience of being arrested and going through the legal system. It's the attendant humiliation. And jail or enforced therapy can be equally distasteful."

A meaningful attack on the drunken driver

would have to include the following steps as a minimum:

1. Each state should adopt an implied-consent statute and a minimum .10 percent presumptive blood-level statute. Once that level is reached, however, safety advocates should push for the more realistic Canadian and British .08 percent levels.

There is much to be said for the comprehensive Canadian and Ontario programs spelled out in the seventh article in this series. Utah has adopted an .08 percent alcohol blood-level statute. Eventually, the 49 other states will have to follow.

2. Police must step up enforcement and apprehension. Traffic units should be enlarged. Selective enforcement of problem areas along the lines of the San Diego force is essential. At the same time, political units should support the forces by realistic budgets.

SENTENCING FLEXIBILITY

3. Legislatures should adopt prearrest breath-test screening along the lines of the British and Baton Rouge, La., programs.

4. Courts must be given greater sentencing flexibility to combine fines, jail sentences, and enforced rehabilitation. But the laws themselves must be enforced.

5. States must tighten driver licensing standards, requiring road and written renewal tests at least every three years. State records systems must be computerized and interlaced—and then tied together into a national grid.

6. States should study the correlation of drinking hours and accident rates. This is perhaps the one area of the problem about which the least research exists. Weekend sales in particular should be given close scrutiny, as well as Saturday evening closing hours. It is no secret that the weekend driving hours are the most dangerous driving hours—and mainly because of alcohol.

HEALTH PROBLEM, TOO

7. Local communities and states must recognize that alcoholism involves health problems and must be treated as such—not as just a criminal offense.

8. Parents, educators, political and religious leaders must challenge the dangerously permissive attitudes about liquor that pervade society. Liquor is a drug, and it must be recognized as such.

9. Corporations and businesses must develop high-priority alcoholism and safe-driving programs.

Millions of miles of highways crisscross the U.S. They were built with tax money. Americans have a right to safety on the highways—control over them. Let's let our public officials know that. And let's demand action. Now.

PEOPLE TELL HOW TO STOP THE DRUNKEN DRIVER

Before this series began, the Monitor invited the public to share ideas on how to stop the drunken driver.

The response to a questionnaire was overwhelming—there were 15,670 returns. They came from specialists, such as traffic safety experts, law-enforcement officials, alcoholism rehabilitation workers, and from concerned private citizens, many of whom had lost relatives or friends because of drunk drivers. They came from all over the world.

Some returns covered large groups of people, such as the safety education class at Texas Wesleyan College, Fort Worth, Texas, which sent back comprehensive classroom papers discussing solutions to the problem.

The largest block of responses, more than 4,800 in all, came from employees of several plants of the Western Electric Company. Company officials had distributed the questionnaire among employees. The results indicated a desire for tougher enforcement through:

Stiffer jail sentences and fines for drinking drivers.

Some type of prearrest road breath test along the lines of the British system.

At the same time, many respondents urged a greater stress on rehabilitation of the problem alcoholic driver.

Here are the tabulated questionnaire results:

More public education.....	7, 853
Compulsory testing to detect drunken drivers (on suspicion alone).....	9, 320
Immediate suspension of driving privileges at first offense.....	7, 082
Stiffer fines.....	9, 041
Stiffer jail sentences.....	9, 888
Compulsory attendance at drivers' school for those convicted.....	6, 956
More uniform laws.....	8, 085
More federal and state studies of why people drink.....	3, 879
Other.....	7, 291

EXCERPTS FROM LETTERS

The victims

"My husband was killed by a drunk driver in 1957 leaving two very young children without a father. . . . Perhaps the thing which has troubled me most over the years was the quick return of the driver's license. I have often wondered if other innocent people have suffered as we did. . . ."

Mrs. Y.

KENMORE, N.Y.

Second offense—get tough

"My first husband was an alcoholic. Many times I was helpless to keep him from driving when he was intoxicated. A few times I tried hiding the car keys, but the frenzied rage he went into was not worth it. Sometimes even I and our two babies had no choice but to ride with him and our lives were endangered. . . . I strongly recommend that a second offender for drunk driving should have his license revoked. . . ."

Mrs. J.

MIAMI.

A national law

"There should be one national law set at .05 percent alcohol in the blood for the legal arrest of the drinking driver. . . . We cannot become too strict with the drinking driver. He threatens the highway safety of us all."

H.

WILMINGTON, DEL.

"The United States Government should withhold from those states that do not adopt a uniform drunk driver standard of .10 percent all funds for federal highway construction."

Unsigned.

A question of morals

"The real answer lies in the change of moral standards which precludes an acceptance of the drunken driver in society."

Ohio municipal court judge.

Weekend duty

"Weekend duty at emergency wards of hospitals. Let the intoxicated driver see . . . the agony, the tears, the heartbreaks involved in auto accidents when he or she is sober."

A Huntsville, Tex., Department of Corrections official.

Liquor-industry responsibility

"It is my opinion that the liquor industry should be held responsible for the great damage and loss of life due to their profitable product. . . ."

Unsigned.

"Maybe it is time the liquor people picked up the tab for rehabilitation instead of Mr. Taxpayer. . . . Somehow add a 1 percent or 2 percent tax to each bottle sold and let it take care of the troubles it causes."

M.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.

"Enforcement of the law is important, but it is attacking only the 'results' of the problem and not the 'cause.' The cause is the drinking, and the reason that that phase is not stressed is simply because too many people like to drink. It is like extinguishing fires without arresting the arsonists. The first step: Prohibit liquor advertising by law."

A Washington State municipal police court judge.

Rehabilitation

"The problem isn't driving: The problem is behavior. . . . Massive public education is needed, so that shame and guilt brought on by alcoholism isn't swept under the rug as it has been for generations, but is brought out into the open so that people learn that there is hope and help (and health) for the alcoholic."

F., an insurance company vice-president.

Fines and jail sentences

"Fines and jail sentences are not likely to achieve anything constructive. I do feel that there should be an immediate suspension of driving privileges and if these are broken they should be punished by a mandatory jail sentence. But it is necessary to bring home to each culprit the enormity of the offense and his punishment should be made in some way to fit the crime, such as being a compulsory attendant to assist ambulance crews at traffic accidents and/or compulsory work to assist traffic accident victims in their hospitalization, treatment, and rehabilitation."

H.

Berlin.

"Suspend the license for life of anyone found driving under the influence of alcohol or of any other drug. . . ."

S., a senior at Sacramento State College.

"I believe that a stiff, uniform drunk-driving code throughout the United States, as in England, would be a deterrent. I do not believe the stiffer fine is the answer. The well-to-do think nothing of it and the more unfortunate lay it out in jail with a needy family being made to suffer. . . ."

An Idaho municipal police chief.

Local control

"I cannot avoid a feeling of impatience at the fatuity demonstrated by your multiple choices. . . . Allow me to dissect them seriatim: More public education: Unlikely to do much good. Everyone officially opposes drunk driving, just as everyone opposes Dutch elm disease and favors the whooping crane. Compulsory testing: You are stepping on my libertarian toes. . . . This is still a democracy, Jack. . . . The issue is inevitably, unavoidably, one of LOCAL CONTROL. Washington can't do a blamed thing. Raleigh can't do much more. Ultimately, the city and county . . . must do it for itself or it won't be done at all."

X.

DURHAM, N.C.

Identification

"Perhaps an indelible marking on the license plate to indicate publicly an offense, or [on] some permanent spot, but where it would not permanently damage the car."

Unsigned.

Insurance

"Insurance companies, with every justification, are raising their auto premiums. But with this increase, careful drivers are being penalized along with the drunken driver. This is not fair.

"Instead, the Department of Revenue should keep the individual insurance company informed of the number of traffic and other violations the client has, so that only the client's rates will be raised and not the rates of other drivers."

J.

BETHEL PARK, PA.

ON DEALING WITH THE TERRORISTS

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution urging the President to use his influence and exert moral leadership to establish a convention of all nations for the purpose of formulating an international agreement on the treatment of airline terrorists and the nations that give them support and asylum.

The events of the past few days have made it abundantly clear that terrorism will spread across the globe like a plague if it is not stopped quickly and firmly. No person using the national or international airways is safe from the terrorist organizations bent on achieving their political objectives by any means necessary. Such practices cannot be condoned by any civilized nation. Such practices are the height of barbarism and threaten the very foundations of orderly society everywhere. The use of terrorism cannot be nicely circumscribed and neatly contained. If the peoples of the world condone its use in one instance it will soon appear in another instance, and another, until no person is safe from it and we are reduced to the law of the jungle.

Not only must the terrorists be caught and punished, but the nations which harbor them must be put on notice that they will feel the weight of world disapproval and worldwide sanctions. They must be made to know that such practices are not acceptable in the community of nations any more than they are acceptable in the community of man. They must be brought to face the possibility of ejection from the community of nations, possibly through diplomatic and economic boycott.

As a starting point, I suggest the airlines of the world and all nations declare an airline boycott against the Arab States that harbor the terrorists and refuse to accept the airlines of those states or to fly to them until the hijackers are declared outlaws in their lands. If international agreement cannot be reached on this point, the United States should initiate its own airline boycott of those states.

The United States, through the Office of the President, in establishing worldwide accord on the treatment of international terrorists and the nations that harbor them and give them asylum, refuge, and support. I have refrained from suggesting the vehicle through which such accord should be reached, in order to give the President as much flexibility as possible in reaching the desired goals. If the convention is to be arranged through the United Nations, participation should not be limited to U.N. member nations. All nations should be invited to participate.

There being no objection, I would like to append to my remarks several newspaper editorials on this subject. Particularly I would like to bring to my col-

leagues' attention the fourth paragraph of the New York Times editorial, "Aerial Blackmail."

[From the New York Times]

AERIAL BLACKMAIL

Only the most uninformed can have been surprised by the latest aerial hijacking and by the ordeals of the unfortunates on the three planes seized by Arab terrorists. The fanatical commando group involved was earlier responsible for many similar outrages. Seven weeks ago these criminals demonstrated the political profitability of hijacking by extorting a promise from the Greek Government to release their jailed confederates. Buoyed by past successes, the Arab gunmen had every reason to suppose aerial blackmail would work against other states. Their judgment appears to have been sound. This outcome can only encourage more acts of piracy by political zealots in every part of the world.

The latest developments raise questions about the assumption that supine surrender to a hijacker is the best way to assure plane passengers' safety. As matters worked out, it was the passengers on the El Al plane, whose crew was prepared to fight back and did so, that fared best. Nonresistance made sense when it could be assumed that a hijacked plane would be brought to some airport governed by international law, and then quickly allowed to depart with its crew and its passengers. But that was not the scenario followed by the blackmailers who captured the Pan American, TWA and Swissair aircraft.

The complete failure of the major airlines to deal with the threat of hijacking is matched only by the impotence of the United States Government in protecting its planes and its citizens. Coming so soon after the Egyptian display of contempt for this country implicit in Cairo's wholesale violation of the standstill provisions of the Middle East cease-fire, the latest incidents must further convince Arab militants that the United States is a paper tiger. And the Israelis will naturally further question the worth of the promises of a country that is unable even to protect its own citizens and planes.

The crux of the problem posed by the Arab hijackings is that the terrorists involved are financed, armed and supported—openly or covertly—by the Arab states. Last July the hijackers of a Greek plane were received as heroes in Cairo. Last Sunday the hijacked Pan American 747 stopped in Beirut to take a commando explosives expert on board so that he could prepare the plane's destruction at Cairo. Yet no action has been taken to apply sanctions.

It is long past time for the airlines and governments of the world to declare a boycott of the Arab states, to refuse to let Arab planes land elsewhere in the world and to refuse to fly non-Arab planes to those countries until the hijackers have been made outlaws in the Arab lands. The failure to take such sanctions in the past has spurred the Arab terrorist campaign against peaceful air travel. Failure to impose sanctions now will mean that the major governments and airlines of the world are de facto accomplices of the fanatics who have endangered so many thousands of people in recent days and who intend to continue their potentially murderous crimes.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 9, 1970]

THE SHOWDOWN IN THE DESERT

The grim drama being played out on the sands of the Jordanian desert is international blackmail in its basest form. The lives of scores of innocent people have been put on the auction block by a gang of vicious, desperate outlaws. What these gangsters expect to gain from this deadly exercise in

ransom and threat is a renewal of the Arab-Israeli war; there is no place for rabid fanatics in a peaceful settlement. By raising their demands to include the release of 3,000 guerrillas held captive in Israel, the Palestine "liberators" made clear their purpose of increasing the pressure on the Israeli government to break the cease-fire, either before or after the ransom deadline runs out tonight.

The negotiations to release the hostages are so delicate now that no useful purpose would be served by public comment on them. Only those in close contact with them can judge the temper of the kidnapers. Those who are making that judgment for the Western nations now being blackmailed are entitled to proceed as best they can without a background of noisy advice. We only hope that in this, as in any other kidnaping, they chose wisely among the few courses of action open.

It is possible, however, to begin to plan ahead in hopes that the nations of the world can take some immediate steps to prevent any repetition of this tragic affair. The world cannot tolerate a threat of this kind to international air travel—a threat in which innocent people are pawns in a deadly international power play. There have been long negotiations and much talk in many national capitals since the wave of airplane hijackings broke out many months ago but very little concerted action. The massive dose of criminal activity that took place in one day—four planes under attack and three seized—ought to convince every nation that this outrage has gone on long enough.

The United States, in our view, should seize the initiative in this situation by ordering this country's airlines to suspend all service to and from any nation that welcomes hijackers, that treats hijacking as a minor offense, or that is unable to prevent its citizens from engaging in hijacking. At the same time, the government should deny landing rights in this country to any airline that serves such nations. This action should be taken, not so much as an economic sanction against offending nations—although there would be significant economic effects—but as a simple safety measure designed to protect American citizens.

There may be legal red tape in such a unilateral approach; international treaties governing landing rights and so on are complex affairs. But this should not be allowed to stand in the way. For one thing, surely most other civilized nations would join in such a ban since it would place the responsibility for hijacking squarely where it belongs—on those governments which have treated it as a game and which have encouraged it by throwing welcoming parties for the pirates. Even if other nations did not join immediately, the United States should take the first step since its prime responsibility in this situation is the safety of its citizens and of those citizens of other countries who travel on American air carriers.

The airlines themselves can help by strengthening their security measures, although the fact that would-be pirates got aboard an El Al plane last Sunday indicates that even Israel's relatively strict precautionary measures are far from fool-proof. It may be that for a while international travelers will have to undergo that kind of scrutiny now given to visitors of prison inmates. If so the price will not be too great if it helps to prevent another showdown on the desert sand.

THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL PERSONNEL ACT

(Mr. BRADENAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970. Already passed by the other body as S. 11, this bill will make possible for State and local government employees a scale and manner of training which have been taken for granted for decades in private business.

I believe, moreover, that this measure will be seen as a vital piece of legislation by all those concerned with the future of the American federal system.

STRENGTHENING THE FEDERAL SYSTEM

For the Intergovernmental Personnel Act is in essence an effort to strengthen the fabric of American federalism by improving the quality of the men and women who serve at all levels of government, State and local as well as Federal.

In this decade, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the work force of State and local governments is expected to increase by 4,400,000 skilled men and women in technical, professional, and administrative positions.

These are the teachers of, and the policemen who will protect, the coming generations; they are the pollution engineers and waste managers; they are the program planners and operations researchers who will administer the quarter of a trillion dollars that the Federal Government will allocate to State and local governments in various forms of assistance over the next decade.

Mr. Speaker, this last astonishing figure is a measure of the complexity of modern life and of the variety of forms of intergovernmental cooperation that we have already invented to meet the challenges of our times. In 1948 Federal aid to States and localities was a mere \$1.8 billion. This year the figure may top \$25 billion, and there is no doubt it will grow. We are just beginning to confront seriously the problems of our contaminated environment. We have not begun seriously to assure the poor and the fatherless of genuine economic security. We have a long way to go to make our school systems what they ought to be.

IMPROVING LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

As we face these problems—and as we face them within a context of creative federalism in which we try to keep government responsive by keeping it close to the people it concerns—we are sure to turn more and more Federal dollars back to localities and States. But this money will be wasted if it is not competently administered.

We know that outside the large cities many heads of government departments are often ill-trained; familiar perhaps with their own regions, they are then uninformed about progress in their fields, about developments in other cities or about alternative ways in which their jobs might be done. In the rural counties and small towns, police and health officers are often desperately overworked and underpaid: to expect them to be well trained is to expect the impossible.

Mr. Speaker, I should also observe that pay scales at the State and local level are often too low to attract competent or qualified people. Operations research po-

sitions which bring comfortable salaries in the Federal Government or industry may offer considerably less in other branches of government.

Mr. Speaker, clearly we cannot expect money to be well spent if it is to be administered by or spent on technical, professional, and administrative workers who have been left behind by the modern demands on their jobs.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

Mr. Speaker, the Intergovernmental Personnel Act has 10 important functions, each of which will materially affect the quality of State and local government administration.

First. Through an advisory council appointed by the President, the bill would make possible the continued monitoring of State and local government training programs. Standards of training for such programs and proposals for the improvement of such training would be developed.

Second. The Civil Service Commission would be authorized to make grants to State and local governments to improve their systems of personnel administration.

Third. The bill will transfer to the Civil Service Commission the responsibility for overseeing the merit personnel administration provisions of certain federally assisted programs.

Fourth. Federal agencies will be authorized to admit State and local government officials to Federal training programs, with such training to be paid for by the Civil Service Commission or by the Federal agency concerned.

Fifth. The bill will authorize Federal agencies to include in their budgets provisions for the training of State and local officials who will be involved in administration of each agency's programs.

Sixth. The Civil Service Commission will be authorized to make grants to the State and local governments themselves to enable them to set up approved programs of employee training, and to finance Government service fellowships for some of their employees in graduate-level training.

Seventh. The Civil Service Commission will be enabled to enter into cooperative recruiting and screening arrangements—at the request of the State and local governments—through which the expertise of the Civil Service Commission will be at the disposal of those bodies.

Eighth. The bill will enable Congress to give its assent to interstate compacts designed to improve the personnel administration and training of State and local governments.

Ninth. Federal, State, and local governments will be authorized to exchange personnel temporarily with one another. Since education is largely a matter of exposure to alternatives, and since the best learning takes place in real life settings, I believe this is an innovation with tremendous possibilities for improving government administration at all levels.

Tenth. The Civil Service Commission will be directed to coordinate the training activities of various Federal agencies so as to cut out duplications and bring

about the most effective use of resources for such training.

ACTION NEEDED NOW

Mr. Speaker, the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 is a natural complement to the education for public service program, of which I was privileged to be sponsor in 1968. The two together promise an improvement in local government administration to parallel that which took place in the Federal Government administration when the Civil Service Commission was created in 1883.

The problems of our time—and the challenges of the future—have been recently diagnosed by the author Alvin Toffler as "Future Shock." He tells us that in the private sector business approaches the challenge of these problems with training: often a man must be trained for new careers as conditions change, perhaps two or three times in his life. Clearly any corporation which never retrained its staff would soon be out of business. Yet the Intergovernmental Personnel Act has twice before come before this House and died here.

Mr. Speaker, the death of this bill again would be a contribution to the continuing crisis in our cities, towns, and State and county governments.

The passing of this bill would be a major contribution to enabling those governments to take up their responsibilities within the Federal Union.

Mr. Speaker, the crises of the future are the missed opportunities of the present. I urge the House not to miss the opportunity presented by the Intergovernmental Personnel Act—an opportunity to make State and local governments work, an opportunity to make the American federal system genuinely effective.

CREATION OF THE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS—ARTICLE BY CHARLES A. QUATTLEBAUM

(Mr. MEEDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, probably one of the more important but least publicized pieces of legislation to emerge from this Congress was that creating the Youth Conservation Corps. It was my pleasure to be the chief House sponsor of the measure which became public law on August 5.

Dr. Charles A. Quattlebaum of the Legislative Reference Service recently prepared an article describing the legislative history and concept of the Youth Conservation Corps. For convenient reference by Members and the public, I insert the article in the RECORD at this point:

CREATION OF THE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS (An article prepared by Charles A. Quattlebaum, specialist in education, Senior Specialists Division, August 26, 1970)

This year, 1970, may become a memorable one for thousands of American youth. On August 5 of this year President Nixon approved an Act of Congress establishing a program to be known as the Youth Con-

ervation Corps. Some persons are already calling it the YCC. It will initially provide summer employment and conservation education for young men and women not less than 15 nor more than 18 years of age. According to plans for the Corps, enrollees will live and work on Federal lands, helping to restore forests, prevent or extinguish fires, improve recreational facilities, and perform other conservation activities. Meanwhile the enrollees will be receiving informal vocational training and experience.

Senator Henry M. Jackson and Representative Lloyd Meeds were the prime sponsors of the legislation in the Senate and in the House of Representatives respectively. The proposal to establish the Corps received bipartisan support in both Houses of Congress.

In the lengthy debate on the floor of the House, the argument for the bill was generally led by Representative Carl D. Perkins, Chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor. The Senate passed the bill without debate.

A PILOT PROGRAM

Reminiscent of the much-praised Civilian Conservation Corps of the nineteen-thirties, the YCC somewhat resembles that organization in basic concept and purpose. However, mindful of some other Federal ventures in education and employment of youth which were adversely criticized in the House debate on the YCC, the Congress provided for initiation of the Corps as a pilot program, costing the Government only \$3.5 million annually for 3 years. Some sponsors of the legislation already have expressed intention to press for expansion of the program if it proves successful, as they believe it will.

In the House debate on the proposed legislation Representative Edward R. Roybal, of California, expressed the wish to see 3 million young people enrolled in the Corps. He predicted that the establishing act of 1970 "will go down in history as perhaps the best piece of domestic legislation passed by this Congress."

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

At intervals during a number of years prior to 1969 various bills to establish youth conservation programs were introduced in Congress. Either in scope or in objectives, however, these earlier bills differed from the proposals to establish a Youth Conservation Corps which were introduced during the first session of the 91st Congress (in 1969).

On February 18, 1969, Senator Henry M. Jackson (for himself and Senator Ted Stevens) introduced S. 1076, a bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps within the Departments of Interior and Agriculture. Senator Jackson was later joined by 24 of his colleagues for the support of this measure. Hearings on the bill, which had been referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, were held before that committee on April 21, 1969. The bill passed the Senate on June 26, 1969, with the title amended so as to read: "An Act to establish a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes. (Congressional Record, vol. 115, pt. 13, p. 17482.)"

In the meantime, on May 12, 1969, Representative Lloyd Meeds (for himself and Representative Wendell Wyatt) had introduced a bill proposing to establish a Youth Conservation Corps within the Department of Labor. This bill was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. On May 5, 1969, and October 8, 1969, respectively, Representatives Thomas S. Foley and Richard T. Hanna introduced bills proposing to establish a Youth Conservation Corps within the Departments of Agriculture and Interior. These bills were also referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. Hearings on all of these bills were held before the Select Com-

mittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor on October 22 and 23, 1969.

On December 19, 1969, H.R. 15361, a new bill to establish a pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, was introduced by Mr. Lloyd Meeds (for himself, Mr. Daniels of New Jersey, Mr. Perkins, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Mr. Dent, Mr. Brademas, Mr. Carey, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. William D. Ford, Mr. Hathaway, Mrs. Mink, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Burton of California, Mr. Gaydos, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Clay, Mr. Powell, and Mr. Esch). Also on December 19, 1969, an identical bill was introduced by Mr. Lloyd Meeds (for himself, Mr. Blatnik, Mr. Kastenmeyer, Mrs. Hansen of Washington, Mr. Adams, Mr. Foley, Mr. Dingell, Mr. Hicks, Mr. Howard, Mr. Saylor, Mr. Pelly, Mrs. May, Mr. Wyatt, and Mr. Sandman).

These bills were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. On March 17, 1970, H.R. 15361 was reported from that committee by Representative Lloyd Meeds. After considerable debate involving several amendments, this bill passed the House by a vote of 256 to 54 on June 15, 1970. The Committee on Education and Labor was then discharged from further consideration of the similar bill which had passed the Senate (S. 1076); and the House agreed to a motion by committee chairman Carl D. Perkins to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1076 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 15361, as passed. The Senate bill, as thus amended, was then passed and H.R. 15361 was laid on the table (Congressional Record, page 19759, June 15, 1970).

DIGEST OF THE DEBATED PROPOSAL

The Senate passed S. 1076 without floor debate on the basis of pro and con material having been presented in the committee hearings and report on the bill. In order to perceive the applicability of some of the arguments set forth in the extensive debate on the floor of the House of Representatives, it is necessary to understand the proposal then under consideration by the House. Following is a digest of H.R. 15361 as it was presented to the House, before amendments, on June 15, 1970:

The bill proposed to further the development and maintenance of the natural resources of the United States by establishing a 3-year pilot program to be designated as the Youth Conservation Corps program. As proposed: (1) The Corps would have consisted of youth of both sexes, ages 14 through 18, employed by the Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee, which would have been created by the act. (2) The Corps would have been open to youth of all social, economic, and racial classifications. (3) Service as a member of the Corps would have been limited to not more than 90 days during any single year. (4) The Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee would have been composed of six persons, representing the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and Labor, who would have administered the Corps. (5) The committee would have (a) designated the public lands upon which members of the Corps could be effectively utilized in conservation work; (b) determined the rates of pay, hours, and other conditions of employment in the Corps; and (c) performed other duties specified in the act. (6) To carry out this program the act would have authorized an appropriation of not to exceed \$3,500,000 annually for 3 years.

ARGUMENTS ADVANCED PRO AND CON

In brief and in substance, the following arguments favorable and unfavorable to this proposal, as expressed in H.R. 15361 and as reported in the House, were brought forth in the relevant Senate and House committee hearings and reports and in the House floor debate. While some of these arguments were not originally advanced in specific reference

to H.R. 15361 the applicability of these arguments to that bill, as reported in the House, is demonstrable.

Altogether, in the hearings and on the floor, the favorable arguments were set forth at greater length than the opposing arguments. Hence in the following summary the pros run proportionately longer than the cons. All of the arguments are not stated in either case.

DIGEST OF THE FAVORABLE ARGUMENTS OFFERED

Following is a summary of the favorable arguments that were offered.

Young people employed in the Youth Conservation Corps would help reduce the tremendous backlog of work needing to be done in our national parks and forests and other public lands. The work accomplished by the Youth Conservation Corps would be of inestimable value to the public.

The Corps would provide the enrollees experience of great educational importance. Their participation in public service conservation undertakings would have maturing and stabilizing effects in the development of their personalities. They would acquire appreciation of our Nation's natural resources, and understanding of the needs and methods for maintaining their great national heritage.

The proposed Youth Conservation Corps would enroll young people within the age group most in need of summer employment. The Nation has an obligation to provide its youth opportunities for constructive use of their time during the out-of-school summer months.

The proposed program would not represent a duplication or overlapping of any existing program for youth. Generally persons claiming that the purposes of the proposed program could be achieved through existing programs have disregarded differences in goals as well as other important differences.

The Youth Conservation Corps would provide constructive and "relevant" experience for restless youth who complain that they cannot find such experience in traditional school curricula.

At this time of great national concern over the quality of the environment, the Youth Conservation Corps would offer opportunity to contribute to environmental improvement for present and future generations. The Corps would lead toward a public effort to build the ecological basis needed for a modern society.

By providing summer earnings and stimulating interest in learning the proposed program would prevent many youngsters from dropping out of school. By providing meaningful work for youth the program would prevent much juvenile delinquency and crime.

Competent and suitable supervisors and instructors for the Youth Conservation Corps could be chosen from the reservoir of high school and college faculty available for employment during the summer months.

Boys and girls are together in the streets and alleys without any supervision at all. They would have some supervision in the YCC and both sexes should be included in the program.

Boys and girls only 14 and 15 years of age are not too young to be included. Experience has shown that both sexes can do useful conservation work without using potentially dangerous tools. The Youth Conservation Corps would not continue the discrimination against girls practiced by the Job Corps.

The highly successful experience with the Civilian Conservation Corps years ago showed the merits of the proposal expressed in H.R. 15361. Nevertheless, there would be distinct advantages in initiating the Youth Conservation Corps as a pilot program.

Because of the great differences in basic purposes and in other respects, the cost of

the proposed program per enrollee is not fairly comparable to the cost per enrollee in any other program. The Youth Conservation Corps would represent a wise investment in improvement of our public lands and in the growth potential of youthful citizens.

The proposed 90-day employment period would be adequate for the purposes of the Corps. The proposed legislation wisely provides that enrollees in the Corps would be employed on conservation projects as near to their homes as is practicable.

One of the most desirable and distinctive features of the proposed program is that it would be open to all American youth. In the Nation's attempt to solve its youth problems, and combat poverty, one of the great fallacies has been the assumption that young people in families of low income are the disadvantaged youth of the Nation. Young people can be disadvantaged or deprived in many different ways. Most of the Nation's youth are deprived of experience in conservation activities. In the Youth Conservation Corps enrollees of various backgrounds would learn from each other.

Some persons have referred to the proposed Youth Conservation Corps as if it would be a categorical manpower training program. It would not be such. Therefore, initiation of the Youth Conservation Corps would not conflict with the aims of the administration's proposed Manpower Training Act.

H.R. 15361 represents a bipartisan proposal.

DIGEST OF THE UNFAVORABLE ARGUMENTS ADVANCED

Following is a summary of the unfavorable arguments that were expressed.

The proposed restriction of employment in the Youth Conservation Corps to 90 days in a calendar year would limit the usefulness of the program. It cannot promise to achieve its goals of conservation and personal development in such a short time.

The cost of the proposed program per enrollee would be high in comparison with the cost of some comparable programs, such as the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer program. The 4-H program, if extended, could give urban youngsters outdoor experience without the Government's employing them.

The Government is already involving disadvantaged young people in conservation activities through the Job Corps conservation centers, the community action agencies, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Much of the conservation work which can be safely performed by youth is near their homes and does not involve transportation to remote locations in national parks and forests. It would be better to expand the existing programs than to initiate a new one.

The proposed program is not directed to disadvantaged youth, as it should be. These youth are most in need of work experience and income.

The proposed legislation does not adequately provide for the supervision and safety of enrollees in the Youth Conservation Corps. Their use of power tools in remote locations would be hazardous. Sufficient recruitment of competent supervisory personnel would be problematical.

The base of the legislation should be broadened so as to provide learning opportunities in many areas besides conservation.

It is not practical to try to draw together in a single program the interests of boys and girls ranging from 14 to 18 years of age. Those only 14 or 15 years old are too young to be included, as is proposed in the bills.

To bring together boys and girls of both races, 14 to 18 years of age, in forest camps would be very unwise.

Letters from the Departments of Agriculture, Labor and Interior show that none of these departments wants to administer the YCC program.

The State and local governments should take responsibility for programs such as the proposed YCC. It would be a good program for the States or localities but not for the Federal Government.

The proposed program would create a new bureaucracy when we need more consolidation and saving of administrative costs.

Creation of the Youth Conservation Corps would further fragment the Nation's manpower training effort and conflict with the integrating efforts of the administration's proposed Manpower Training Act.

AMENDMENTS TO THE HOUSE BILL

Early in the House debate on the YCC bill, Representative B. F. Sisk stated: "It is my understanding that the authors have agreed to accept some amendments and I expect to support them." Several amendments were adopted. One of these changed the age limitation for enrollees from 14 to 18 inclusive to 16 to 18 inclusive. Another gave authority to the Federal administrators of the Corps to arrange "directly or by contract with any public agency or organization or any private nonprofit agency or organization which has been in existence for five years" for services and equipment for the needs of members of the Corps. Another amendment transferred the responsibility for administration of the YCC from the proposed Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture.

PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC LAW 91-378

Except for these amendments the Act as passed by both Houses of Congress and approved by the President (Public Law 91-378) is not markedly different from the bill (H.R. 15361) which was debated in the House. In layman's language, here are the principal features of the law.

The Act provides for gainful employment during the summer months of American youth, representing all segments of society.

It provides that this employment shall take place in the healthful atmosphere afforded in the national park system, the national forest system, the national wildlife refuge system, and other public land and water areas administered by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture.

The declared purpose of the Act is to further the development and maintenance of the natural resources of the United States by the youth upon whom will fall the ultimate responsibility for maintaining and managing these resources.

The Act establishes in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture a 3-year pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps.

It specifies that the Corps shall consist of young men and women who are permanent residents of the United States, its territories, or possessions, who have attained age 15 but not age 19. It provides for employment of these young people during the summer months without regard to civil service classification laws, rules or regulations. It opens the Corps to youth of both sexes and of all social, economic and racial classifications. It limits employment of an individual in the Corps to 90 days during any single year.

The Act specifies certain duties of the Secretary of the Interior and of the Secretary of Agriculture relating to the Corps, including the following: (1) To determine the areas under their administrative jurisdictions which are appropriate for carrying out programs using employees of the Corps. (2) To determine the rates of pay, hours, and other conditions of employment in the Corps. (3) To provide for such transportation, lodging, subsistence, and other services and equipment as they may deem necessary or appropriate for the needs of members of the Corps. (4) To promulgate regulations to insure the

safety, health and welfare of the Corps members. (5) To prepare a report indicating the most feasible and efficient method for initiating a cost sharing youth conservation program with State natural resource, conservation, or outdoor recreation agencies; and to submit this report to the President not later than one year following enactment of this Act for transmittal to the Congress.

The Act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to contract with any public agency or organization or any private nonprofit agency or organization which has been in existence for at least 5 years for the operation of any Youth Conservation Corps project. The Act requires that, wherever economically feasible, existing but unoccupied Federal facilities shall be utilized for purposes of the Corps. The Act also requires that Corps members shall be employed on conservation projects as near to their places of residence as is feasible.

The Act specifies that upon completion of each year's pilot program the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare a joint report detailing the contribution of the program toward achieving the purposes of the Act. It also requires that this report be submitted to the President and that he transmit it to Congress.

For carrying out its purposes the Act authorizes an annual appropriation to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture of not to exceed \$3,500,000 annually for 3 years.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MAYOR CHARLES PUKSTA, OF CLAREMONT, N.H.

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, recently a leading New Hampshire civic leader was appointed by President Nixon to the National Advisory Council on Adult Education. Charles Puksta, currently the mayor of Claremont, N.H., is an outstanding community leader. He has given selflessly of his time over the years in making Claremont a better city and will surely make a significant contribution as a member of the Advisory Council.

The need for better adult education programs has been long recognized by Mayor Puksta, who happens to be a personal friend as well as a constituent of mine. He is well aware of the fact that we need good adult education programs to complement the traditional youth-oriented educational system.

As an outstanding local community leader, he will be in a position to add much to the Advisory Council on Adult Education by making available his experience at the grassroots. Members of Congress are all too aware of the tendency of Washington-based experts to assume that they have all of the answers, to the extent that they often have lost touch with the very real problems of local communities. One answer to this problem lies in advisory councils like this one, so that outstanding community leaders like Charles Puksta can contribute their viewpoint and considerable local experience.

The Claremont Daily Eagle recently congratulated Mayor Puksta on his appointment with an excellent editorial

written and signed by the publisher, Ed Bennett. An outstanding civic leader himself, Ed Bennett has worked with Charlie Puksta on many endeavors and is in a good position to comment on the appointment. It is my privilege to have known and had the chance to work with both of these noted community and State leaders of New Hampshire.

I join the Claremont Daily Eagle in saying, "Well done, Charlie Puksta."

The editorial follows:

CONGRATULATIONS, MAYOR PUKSTA

Announcement was made this week of the appointment by President Nixon of Mayor Charles Puksta to the National Advisory Council on Adult Education.

Congratulations to the mayor for this singular honor and our thanks to him for his public service and dedication to Claremont so that a citizen of our community should be so recognized.

Mayor Puksta has unselfishly devoted most of his spare time to his community and to the political party of his choice, which happens to be Republican.

Over the years, since we have been in Claremont, Charlie Puksta has doggedly and faithfully served the city in a number of capacities.

No, "yes man," he has sometimes taken unpopular decisions, stated his case and stuck with his convictions.

A member of Claremont's active Polish community, Charlie and his wife, Lorraine, live humbly and work hard, their family of fine children helping Mrs. Puksta with their neighborhood store.

Mr. Puksta's service to Claremont cannot be measured in dollars and cents; the yardstick is the mayor's continued willingness to serve on the city council at no pay and the city's obvious satisfaction with his service.

The mayor is now serving his seventh consecutive term, two terms of which were assistant mayor, and two terms as mayor.

Claremonters will share Charlie's pleasure and satisfaction with the President's appointment.

They will join with The Eagle in wishing him well in this new, additional public service.

AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL POLL

(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, a misleading poll of public and congressional views on issues of national security is about to be released and disseminated nationwide by the American Security Council, headquartered in Washington, D.C. There is no doubt that the results of the poll when released will purport to show overwhelming support for the Council's rightwing views of the "national security issues" covered by the poll. The procedures followed and the questions themselves are designed to encourage those who agree with the council to fill out and return the questionnaire and to discourage those who disagree from doing so. This represents built-in distortion and adds up to a fraud upon the public. Members of the executive branch and of the Congress and representatives of the media should weigh the poll accordingly.

The American Security Council has,

over the past several months, sent out thousands of letters to what it calls "opinion leaders" across the country requesting them to "serve on the national voter advisory board" of the council, to fill out a 10-point questionnaire on various "national security" questions, and to contribute \$10 or more to help prepare and distribute the poll results to the news media, campaign workers, President Nixon, and the Congress. A mailing was sent to newspaper editors requesting them to publish the questionnaire and report the results. The council has also announced it is preparing a special analysis of the "actual national security voting record of each Member of Congress" for use in the coming fall elections.

The Council's so-called poll is a fraud in several respects. First, the letter accompanying the questionnaire implies that respondents must make at least a \$10 contribution in order to become a member of the National Advisory Board and have their questionnaire replies counted. Obviously, those who do not support the ultraconservative positions of the Council will not fill out and return the poll because they will not want to contribute the \$10.

Furthermore, while the Council indicates that its poll is intended to be sound and accurate, the wording and presentation of its questionnaire are anything but unbiased. Consider, for example, the following quotations from the ASC cover-letter accompanying the questionnaire:

We believe that most Americans support a strong national defense against Communist aggression, but we can't prove it without your cooperation in this poll.

Our staffers are not only expert on strategic military affairs but are also very knowledgeable on the various forces at work internally to destroy our country—the Communist Party, the Black Panthers, SDS, the Yippies, etc.

Many voters are not aware of how some Senators such as Kennedy, Gore, Muskie, Fulbright, Goodell, McGovern, Cranston, and others have taken positions on national security matters which weaken America's defense against Communism. For example, they all oppose President Nixon on both missile defense and Vietnam.

Thoughtful men may disagree about the significance and usefulness of polls in general. But no one would disagree that in order to be at all accurate, objective, and meaningful, polls should be conducted with extreme impartiality by organizations disinterested in the issues under inquiry. The American Security Council surely does not fit that description. It is generally regarded as a rightwing organization. If it was founded and is still heavily supported by defense contractors and defense-related industries. It is clear from its publications and letters that it has very definite prejudices and views on matters of national security, and that it has equally definite intentions with regard to what its poll results ought to indicate.

In view of these facts, I want to urge my colleagues in the Congress and the representatives of the media to exercise due caution in the significance they might attach to the findings of the American Security Council when those "findings" are released. They should be

recognized for what they are—rigged rightwing propaganda. No more significance should be attached to them than would be attached to findings similarly arrived at by any organization committed to a firm position on national security issues, whatever its location on the political spectrum.

SATELLITE AIRWAVES FOR EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING

(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, the position that the United States will take at the World Administrative Radio Conference for Space Telecommunications, which will be held in Geneva, Switzerland, in June 1971, does not give adequate recognition and support to the needs of noncommercial and educational interests.

The U.S. position is being tailored to serve the Defense Department and commercial, profitmaking organizations at great expense to potential users of noncommercial, public satellite services, such as those provided by public broadcasting and other educational outlets. These potential users would include universities, school districts, hospitals, et cetera. The United States tentative position, which is now in its Seventh Draft at the Federal Communications Commission, makes available a disproportionate share of the frequency spectrum to the Department of Defense without requiring DOD to justify their present and future potential needs for frequency allocations with the same rigor that is being required of other applicants for use of the radio frequency spectrum. Private, commercial users of satellite communications are being given most of the remaining available frequency spectrum.

It is urgent that this situation be corrected before the final U.S. position is formulated and presented to the World Conference at Geneva next year. Accordingly I have sent letters to FCC Chairman Dean Burch, to Secretary of State William P. Rogers, to Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Elliot Richardson, to Presidential adviser Robert Finch, and to NASA Administrator Thomas O. Paine. These letters make specific recommendations for changes in the U.S. position in order to assure that the interests of noncommercial, public users of satellite services will be protected. The following is the text of my letter to FCC Chairman Dean Burch:

LETTER TO FCC CHAIRMAN DEAN BURCH
SEPTEMBER 5, 1970.

In the matter of an inquiry relating to preparation for a World Administrative Radio Conference of the International Telecommunication Union on matters pertaining to the radio astronomy and space services.—Docket No. 18294

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to urge that greater consideration be given to the exclusive allocation of a bandwidth of approximately 200 MHz for satellite services for non-commercial, public users, such as public broadcasting and educational services. I would urge that the preliminary

"Draft Proposals of the United States of America for the World Administrative Radio Conference for Space Telecommunications—Geneva, 1971," be modified to include such an exclusive allocation.

Paragraph 16 of the Seventh Notice of Inquiry states that "neither the Commission nor the OTM denies that a future requirement might develop for interconnection between and among the various educational outlets to the public." However the Commission and the OTM appear convinced that, based on present needs, there is no justification for an exclusive allocation of frequency spectrum for educational purposes at this time. I would dispute that conclusion. If public and educational users are to be able to plan and construct facilities at the lowest possible cost, they must be assured that the necessary frequency spectrum will be available. An exclusive allocation in the 2500-2690 MHz band would make it possible for potential non-commercial, public users of satellite services to plan for the installation of inexpensive, receive-only ground terminals. While the Commission urges educators to look to the 11.7-12.2 GHz range for future accommodation of any interconnection requirements, the higher cost of the equipment required by the receiving stations would make such an allocation less desirable than in the 2500-2690 MHz band. The organizations which will be setting up these receive-only facilities will likely be the public and educational users, such as universities, local school districts, hospitals, etc. to whom the cost differential will be most critical.

I would also urge that if an additional portion of the frequency spectrum must be found to accommodate those users to which the 2500-2690 MHz space frequency spectrum is now proposed to be allocated, that the frequencies assigned to the Department of Defense be re-examined. I realize that the FCC has no statutory authority over the allocation and assignment of frequencies to the Executive Branch, including the Department of Defense. However, because of the growing demand by non-governmental users of the airwaves which needs to be met, I would appreciate whatever influence you can bring to bear to require reevaluation by the Executive Branch of its spectrum requirements. Particularly, the Department of Defense should be required to justify its present and its potential future needs for frequency allocations with the same rigor that is required of other applicants for use of the radio frequency spectrum. For example, by allocating earth resources satellites to some of the frequencies which DOD may now be using for similar reconnaissance satellites, the 2500-2690 MHz band could be allocated for satellite services for non-commercial, public users.

It is high time that non-commercial and educational interests be accorded new recognition and sufficient frequency allocations to fully develop their services. To seek their support for this position, I am sending copies of this letter to Congressman Harley O. Staggers, Chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; Congressman Torbert H. Macdonald, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications and Power; Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce; and Senator John O. Pastore, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM.

PALESTINIAN TERRORISTS' HI-JACKINGS DEMAND U.S. ACTION

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the world remains watching while three hijacked airplanes stand in the Jordan desert, their passengers' lives standing blackmail for the release of Palestinian terrorists. A fourth jet was destroyed in Cairo, after having been flown there at the command of its hijackers. Fortunately, no lives were lost. And a fifth jet's hijacking was only barely averted.

In all these instances, Palestinian terrorists were the criminals who perpetrated these hijackings. Acting with complete disregard for the law, they challenge the right of every nation, and of every nation's citizens, to travel in safety and security. And, what is more, they are challenging the right of Israel to exist.

This state of affairs simply cannot be allowed to exist.

The Palestinian terrorists have established themselves as an apparently independent fifth column within Jordan. In fact, their complete disdain for and resistance to the authority of the Jordanian Government—now carried to the extreme of overt hostilities—is object lesson which should be well contemplated by those who call upon Israel to open her doors and accept within her borders all the Palestinians now settled in her neighbors' lands. The actions of the Palestinian guerrillas rebut the suggestion of such action upon Israel's part.

The difficulties of the current situation do not justify diplomatic torpor, however. Again, if object lessons have any value—and they do—the past inaction of this administration in responding to the plight of Israel should demonstrate very clearly that it cannot stand mute now.

The matter of plane hijackings should be laid before the United Nations by the President in person. Both the Palestinian terrorists and the Arab States, which have—both covertly and overtly—offered support and assistance to the terrorists, look to that body for sympathy and as a forum for propaganda. While that body may be weak in terms of available courses of action it can undertake, its political value can be, and is, significant. The presence of the President of the United States cannot help but engender condemnation of the terrorists' tactics in that forum.

But not only must the President appear before the United Nations to condemn the acts of terrorism which have been, and continue to be, perpetrated. He must also call for an agreement between all nations of the world community to extradite hijackers to the country in which they committed their crime. Those nations which refuse to sign such an agreement must be declared off limits to passenger planes flying in international commerce.

Acting unilaterally, the President should direct the Civil Aeronautics Board to bar the use of U.S. airports by the planes of any nation which offers succor to hijackers.

In addition, Federal marshals in sufficient numbers should be assigned to in-

ternational airports within this country, and the development and placement of weapons detection mechanisms at these airports must be expedited.

The dire peril which faces those hostages in the Jordanian desert demands the strongest condemnation by this country. The constant and growing peril which endangers Israel demands the same. To choose a phrase from the editorial which appeared in the September 9 edition of the Washington Post, the United States "should seize the initiative."

At this point, I should like to append this editorial, which I commend to my colleagues as a well-reasoned presentation which I support:

THE SHOWDOWN IN THE DESERT

The grim drama being played out on the sands of the Jordanian desert is international blackmail in its basest form. The lives of scores of innocent people have been put on the auction block by a gang of vicious, desperate outlaws. What these gangsters expect to gain from this deadly exercise in ransom and threat is a renewal of the Arab-Israeli war; there is no place for rabid fanatics in a peaceful settlement. By raising their demands to include the release of 3,000 guerrillas held captive in Israel, the Palestine "liberators" made clear their purpose of increasing the pressure on the Israeli government to break the cease-fire, either before or after the ransom deadline runs out tonight.

The negotiations to release the hostages are so delicate now that no useful purpose would be served by public comment on them. Only those in close contact with them can judge the temper of the kidnapers. Those who are making that judgment for the Western nations now being blackmailed are entitled to proceed as best they can without a background of noisy advice. We only hope that in this, as in any other kidnaping, they choose wisely among the few courses of action open.

It is possible, however, to begin to plan ahead in hopes that the nations of the world can take some immediate steps to prevent any repetition of this tragic affair. The world cannot tolerate a threat of this kind to international air travel—a threat in which innocent people are pawns in a deadly international power play. There have been long negotiations and much talk in many national capitals since the wave of airplane hijackings broke out many months ago but very little concerted action. The massive dose of criminal activity that took place in one day—four planes under attack and three seized—ought to convince every nation that this outrage has gone on long enough.

The United States, in our view, should seize the initiative in this situation by ordering this country's airlines to suspend all service to and from any nation that welcomes hijackers, that treats hijacking as a minor offense, or that is unable to prevent its citizens from engaging in hijacking. At the same time, the government should deny landing rights in this country to any airline that serves such nations. This action should be taken, not so much as an economic sanction against offending nations—although there would be significant economic effects—but as a simple safety measure designed to protect American citizens.

There may be legal red tape in such a unilateral approach; international treaties governing landing rights and so on are complex affairs. But this should not be allowed to stand in the way. For one thing, surely most other civilized nations would join in such a ban since it would place the responsibility for hijacking squarely where it belongs—on those governments which

have treated it as a game and which have encouraged it by throwing welcoming parties for the pirates. Even if other nations did not join immediately, the United States should take the first step since its prime responsibility in this situation is the safety of its citizens and of those citizens of other countries who travel on American air carriers.

The airlines themselves can help by strengthening their security measures, although the fact that would-be pirates got aboard an El Al plane last Sunday indicates that even Israel's relatively strict precautionary measures are far from fool-proof. It may be that for a while international travelers will have to undergo the kind of scrutiny now given to visitors of prison inmates. If so the price will not be too great if it helps to prevent another showdown on the desert sand.

AIRCRAFT HIJACKING

(Mr. SYMINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in my first address to the House 2 years ago, I warned of the dangers of aircraft hijacking. At that time, I urged the State Department to take action to prevent a recurrence of such incidents.

A few months ago, I introduced a resolution urging an international convention to prevent the kidnaping and harassment of diplomatic personnel. I was joined in that resolution by 33 of my colleagues. Today, troubled by the consequences of inaction, I am introducing a revised version of that resolution which would extend its provisions to peaceful international travelers.

The inviolable right of individuals to unmolested international passage and the worldwide observance of diplomatic immunity are essential to maintain world peace. I am hopeful that my resolution will initiate action to deter groups seeking political advantage from such international crimes, and to provide for the swift administration of justice to those not deterred.

I shall urge my colleagues to join me in sponsoring this resolution.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, upon coming to the United States, Svetlana Alliluyeva, Joseph Stalin's daughter, stated:

Nobody here can realize the difference between the free world and the world of totalitarian ideology.

As one who witnessed and experienced the tyranny of the Soviet Union, she suggested that those who condemn America "should go and try it."

QUINCENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF AMERICA'S DISCOVERY

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing in the Congress a concurrent resolution designating the State of Illinois as the host for the official celebration of the 500th anniversary of the discovery of America.

In 1892, the State of Illinois had the honor to host the official celebration for the 400th anniversary of America's discovery and did an admirable job in presenting the highly successful World's Columbian Exposition which more than 27 million people attended. It is entirely appropriate, therefore, that Illinois, in 1992, be given the honor of leading the 500th anniversary celebration of this important event.

The members of the Sixth Illinois Constitutional Convention, when they met recently in Springfield, Ill., unanimously adopted Constitutional Convention Resolution No. 68 encouraging the general assembly of the State of Illinois to make appropriate plans for the 500th anniversary celebration of America's discovery, and further, encouraging the Congress of the United States to recognize the State of Illinois as host to the official celebration of this anniversary.

I want to commend and congratulate each of the signers of this resolution for their foresight in endorsing a resolution that will make it possible to celebrate approximately the 500th anniversary of Christopher Columbus' momentous discovery.

Indeed, when the great Italian navigator discovered America in 1492, he not only achieved the most spectacular and important geographical discovery in the history of our planet, but he opened the door to development of the Western Hemisphere. His discovery, therefore, marked the actual beginning of our culture and country, as well as the other countries in both North and South America. Today the greatest democracy known to man is flourishing in America, and the indomitable spirit of Columbus has become part of us and our way of life.

As one of the early cosponsors of legislation to establish Columbus Day as a national legal holiday, I was certainly gratified when the United States Congress, in 1968, finally passed the Monday Holiday bill which accomplished this objective. The bill goes into effect in 1971, when for the first time in our Nation's history, Columbus Day will be celebrated as a national legal holiday on the second Monday in October.

The proper quincentennial observance of Columbus' epic voyage and discovery is the right and privilege of all Americans, and Illinois, having hosted the celebration once before, is seeking recognition for that honor once again.

Mr. Speaker, the great State of Illinois, and Chicago, the "hub of America," would be the ideal choice for hosting this celebration. First of all, Chicago is centrally located in relation to all portions of the country, and additionally, is the approximate center of our Nation's population. Twenty-eight railroads operate into Chicago, while 25 airlines, including 11 international flights, service Chicago, flying into Midway Airport and the world famous O'Hare International Airport. These facilities provide easy access not

only to Chicago but to the entire State as well, and thus, a greater potential exists for drawing together visitors from all parts of the Nation, as well as from abroad.

Furthermore, Illinois during recent years has developed an interstate and intrastate highway system that is unexcelled and provides modern, rapid access to the city of Chicago and to Illinois via automobiles and buses. During 1967 alone, a total of \$268,500,000 was spent on primary highways in Illinois, and in subsequent years, approximately equal amounts have been spent to improve the roads in Illinois.

Additionally, I want to point out that hotel, motel, and restaurant facilities in Chicago are among the most outstanding in our country. Chicago has long been recognized as the convention city and as such has established a fine record of meeting the needs of countless visitors to the heartland of America. Furthermore, Illinois recreational facilities, including land set aside for camping, fishing, hunting, boating, swimming, and water sports, totals more than 187,000 acres, and these facilities are maintained especially for the use of the people by the Illinois Department of Conservation.

By selecting Illinois as the official host for this celebration, Americans residing on the east and west coasts would be given the opportunity to become better acquainted with the marvelous development of America's great Midwest area. The tremendous growth of commercial, industrial, and cultural activities in the hub of America I feel best typifies the progress of civilization that has been made in the New World, the discovery of which the proposed quincentennial celebration is to commemorate.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, and for countless others too numerous to list, Illinois, and the city of Chicago, would be the ideal choice to act as official host for the quincentennial celebration. Therefore, in order that ample time may be set aside to make appropriate arrangements for this 500th anniversary observance of America's discovery, I urge that my colleagues join together to insure the early enactment of my resolution recognizing Illinois as the host for this official celebration.

The text of the resolution adopted by the Sixth Illinois Constitutional Convention, which I mentioned earlier, follows:

RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE 500TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DISCOVERY OF AMERICA
(Proposed by the Legislative Committee, Sixth Illinois Constitutional Convention)

Whereas the Constitution of Illinois, as amended, proposed appropriate assistance for the World's Columbian Exposition held in Chicago pursuant to an Act of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the official celebration for the 400th anniversary of the discovery of America was held in the State of Illinois and the City of Chicago; and

Whereas plans should soon be made for the 500th anniversary of the discovery of America; and

Whereas the delegates to this Convention are proud of the Columbian heritage of our State and Nation;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Sixth Illinois Constitutional Convention in Convention assembled that:

Article 1. The General Assembly of the State of Illinois be encouraged to make appropriate plans for the celebration of the discovery of America; and

Article 2. The members of the Illinois Congressional delegation in the United States Congress be encouraged to have the State of Illinois designated to host the official celebration of the 500th anniversary of the discovery of America.

LIST OF SIGNERS

George J. Lewis, Chairman; Lucy Reum, Vice Chairman; Samuel L. Martin; Clifford P. Kelley; Anthony M. Peccarelli; Louis J. Perona; John L. Knuppel; William A. Sommerschild; Mary A. Pappas; William J. Laurino; Frank D. Stemberk.

PETITION SUPPORTING CONVENTION RESOLUTION ON THE DISCOVERY OF AMERICA

DISTRICT 1
Samuel W. Witwer, and Frank Cicero, Jr.

DISTRICT 2
Mrs. Lucy Reum and T. J. McCracken.

DISTRICT 3
John G. Woods and Mrs. V. B. Macdonald.

DISTRICT 4
Clyde Parker and Mrs. Anne H. Evans.

DISTRICT 5
John E. Dvorak and Mrs. Anne Willer.

DISTRICT 6
Martin Ozinga, Jr. and James E. Gierach.

DISTRICT 7
Joseph A. Tecson and Roy C. Pechous.

DISTRICT 8
Ray H. Garrison and Thomas H. Miller.

DISTRICT 9
Mrs. J. G. Anderson and Joseph T. Meek.

DISTRICT 10
Peter A. Tomei and Paul F. Elward.

DISTRICT 11
Martin Tuchow and Bernard Weisberg.

DISTRICT 12
Mrs. Dawn C. Netsch and Malcolm S. Kamin.

DISTRICT 13
Ronald C. Smith and Elmer Gertz.

DISTRICT 14
John F. Leon and William J. Laurino.

DISTRICT 15
Thomas G. Lyons and David E. Stahl.

DISTRICT 16
William F. Lennon and James E. Strunck.

DISTRICT 17
Harold M. Nudelman and Frank Orlando.

DISTRICT 18
Edward J. Rosewell and Leonard N. Foster.

DISTRICT 19
Joseph C. Sharpe, Sr. and William A. Jaskula.

DISTRICT 20
Victor A. Arrigo and Madison L. Brown.

DISTRICT 21
Frank D. Stemberk and Mrs. G. S. Pugh-sley.

DISTRICT 22
Samuel A. Patch and James H. Kemp.

DISTRICT 23
Richard M. Daley and Leonard F. Miska.

DISTRICT 24
Miss Odas Nicholson and Albert A. Raby.

DISTRICT 25
Fr. F. X. Lawlor and Louis Marolda.

DISTRICT 26
Thomas E. Hunter and Clifford P. Kelley.

DISTRICT 27

Michael J. Madigan and Joseph V. Rachunas.

DISTRICT 28

Philip J. Carey and Ted A. Borek.

DISTRICT 29

Charles A. Coleman and Richard K. Cooper.

DISTRICT 30

David Linn and Mrs. Mary. Lee Leahy.

DISTRICT 31

John D. Wenum and Mrs. Mary A. Pappas.

DISTRICT 32

Mrs. J. Mullen and Jeffrey R. Ladd.

DISTRICT 33

Stanley C. Johnson and Mrs. Maxine Wymore.

DISTRICT 34

Robert R. Canfield and Mrs. Betty A. Keegan.

DISTRICT 35

Harlan H. Rigney and Wayne W. Whalen.

DISTRICT 36

Louis J. Perona and Edwin F. Peterson.

DISTRICT 37

Paul E. Mathias and David Davis.

DISTRICT 38

Mrs. Betty Howard and James S. Brannen.

DISTRICT 39

Thomas C. Kelleghan and W. A. Sommerschild.

DISTRICT 40

Mrs. Helen C. Kinney and Anthony M. Peccarelli.

DISTRICT 41

Louis F. Bottino and Arthur T. Lennon.

DISTRICT 42

John L. Knuppel and James S. Thompson.

DISTRICT 43

Lewis D. Wilson and William R. Armstrong.

DISTRICT 44

Charles R. Young and Edward H. Jenison.

DISTRICT 45

David E. Connor and John C. Parkhurst.

DISTRICT 46

Samuel L. Martin and Donald D. Zeglis.

DISTRICT 47

Charles W. Shuman and Henry I. Green.

DISTRICT 48

Clarence E. Yordy and William D. Fogal.

DISTRICT 49

Maurice W. Scott and William L. Fay.

DISTRICT 50

Elbert S. Smith and Franklin E. Dove.

DISTRICT 51

Dwight P. Friedrich and James S. Parker.

DISTRICT 52

Stanley L. Klaus and John Alexander.

DISTRICT 53

Wendell Durr and Ray V. Johnsen.

DISTRICT 54

William F. Fennoy, Jr. and John M. Karns, Jr.

DISTRICT 55

J. L. Buford and Henry C. Hendren, Jr.

DISTRICT 56

Ralph A. Dunn and David Kenney.

DISTRICT 57

Clifford L. Downen and Robert L. Butler.

DISTRICT 58

George J. Lewis and M. A. Hutmacher.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. HAGAN (at the request of Mr. GRAY), for today, September 10, on account of official business.

Mr. CORMAN, for September 10, on account of official business.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BOLAND, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. DIGGS, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. RARICK, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. GIAIMO, on September 15, for 60 minutes.

Mr. GIAIMO, on September 16, for 60 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WIDNALL, to revise and extend his remarks during debate on H.R. 17795 today.

Mr. GROSS to revise and extend his remarks made today on H.R. 17795.

Mr. SCHMITZ during debate on H.R. 17982.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WEICKER.

Mr. LANGEN.

Mr. MORSE in two instances.

Mr. ADAIR.

Mr. McCLORY.

Mr. KLEPPE in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. TAFT in two instances.

Mr. TALCOTT in two instances.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. SCHMITZ in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in four instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in six instances.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. ZION.

Mr. SCHNEEBELL.

Mr. COLLINS in four instances.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mrs. DWYER in five instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HATHAWAY.
 Mr. DINGELL.
 Mr. MATSUNAGA.
 Mr. HÉBERT.
 Mr. KASTENMEIER.
 Mr. ROSENTHAL in eight instances.
 Mr. MINISH.
 Mr. BRADEMÁS in eight instances.
 Mr. PICKLE in three instances.
 Mr. STEED in two instances.
 Mr. DIGGS.
 Mr. HAWKINS in two instances.
 Mr. BIAGGI in five instances.
 Mr. WALDIE in five instances.
 Mr. HOWARD in two instances.
 Mr. ROE in two instances.
 Mr. COHELAN in two instances.
 Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.
 Mr. BENNETT in three instances.
 Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.
 Mr. GAIMO in 10 instances.
 Mr. GIBBONS.
 Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.
 Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey in two instances.
 Mr. RYAN in five instances.
 Mr. MURPHY of Illinois in two instances.
 Mr. JOHNSON of California in two instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3619. An act to revise and expand Federal programs for relief from the effects of major disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 18725. An act to establish a Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia and to provide for a Delegate to the House of Representatives from the District of Columbia.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 18725. A bill to establish a Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia and to provide for a Delegate to the House of Representatives from the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 14, 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:

2363. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Agency for fiscal year 1969, pursuant to section 15 of Public Law 592, 79th Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2364. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting various records relating to the sale of public lands to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada, pursuant to section 4(e) of Public Law 85-339; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2365. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for fiscal year 1969, pursuant to section 16 of the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 18583. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and other laws to provide increased research into, and prevention of, drug abuse and drug dependence; to provide for treatment and rehabilitation of drug abusers and drug dependent persons; and to strengthen existing law enforcement authority in the field of drug abuse (Rept. No. 91-1444 (Parts 1 & 2)). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 16443. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 in order to establish Federal policy concerning the selection of firms and individuals to perform architectural engineering, and related services for the Federal Government; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1445). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:
 H.R. 19115. A bill to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions to make permanent certain provisions thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 19116. A bill to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions to make permanent certain provisions thereunder; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CASEY:
 H.R. 19117. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:
 H.R. 19118. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1931, relating to the furnishing of books and other materials to the blind and to other handicapped persons to authorize the furnishing of musical recordings and tapes to such persons; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CLARK:
 H.R. 19119. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of

1949 in order to establish Federal policy concerning the selection of firms and individuals to perform architectural, engineering, and related services for the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 19120. A bill to provide a program of tax adjustment for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DULSKI:
 H.R. 19121. A bill to create a health security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUDE:
 H.R. 19122. A bill to provide a comprehensive Federal program for the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:
 H.R. 19123. A bill to provide certain retirement benefits under title 5, United States Code, for air traffic controllers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:
 H.R. 19124. A bill to create a special bridge replacement program in title 23, United States Code; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RYAN:
 H.R. 19125. 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.

H.R. 19126. A bill to amend the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act to require the disclosure by retail distributors of unit retail prices of packaged consumer commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:
 H.R. 19127. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to require motor vehicle safety standards relating to the ability of the vehicle to withstand certain collisions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 19128. A bill to extend certain Veterans' Preference Act benefits to civilian employees of the former War Department interned as prisoners of war during World War II; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TAFT:
 H.R. 19129. A bill to protect the personal security and academic freedom of students, faculty, staff, and other employees of institutions of higher education by requiring the adoption of procedures by the States to govern the treatment of disruptive campus violence by students, staff, and other employees, as a precondition to Federal assistance, and to assist such institutions in their efforts to prevent and control campus disorders; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 19130. A bill to amend chapter 3 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to U.S. contributions to international organizations and programs, to provide for a program to control illegal international traffic in narcotics, and to provide for withholding of U.S. assistance to nations refusing to take appropriate steps to control illegal international traffic in narcotics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMÁS:
 H.R. 19131. A bill to establish orderly procedures for the public announcement of contracts awarded by the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRADEMÁS (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. DENT, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. CAREY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MILLS, Mr. FRASER, Mr. LEGGETT, and Mr. MEEDS):

H.R. 19132. A bill to amend the Library Services and Construction Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself and Mr. HATHAWAY):

H.R. 19133. A bill to reinforce the Federal system by strengthening the personnel resources of State and local governments, to improve intergovernmental cooperation in the administration of grant-in-aid programs, to provide grants for improvement of State and local personnel administration, to authorize Federal assistance in training State and local employees, to provide grants to State and local governments for training of their employees, to authorize interstate compacts for personnel and training activities, to facilitate the temporary assignment of personnel between the Federal Government, and State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.R. 19134. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by adding a new title, which restores to local school boards their constitutional power to administer the public schools committed to their charge, confers on parents the right to choose the public schools their children attend, secures to children the right to attend the public schools chosen by their parents, and makes effective the right of public school administrators and teachers to serve in the schools in which they contract to serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUKENS:

H.R. 19135. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical and hospital care through a system of voluntary health insurance financed in whole for low-income groups, through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax credits, and to provide a system of peer review of utilization, charges, and quality of medical service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 19136. A bill designating certain election days as legal public holidays; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 19137. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide in certain cases for an exchange of credits between the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system and the civil service retirement system so as to enable individuals who have some coverage under both systems to obtain maximum benefits based on their combined service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 19138. A bill to prohibit flight in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution for the killing of a policeman or fireman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 19139. A bill to provide for a program of Federal assistance in the development, acquisition, and installation of aircraft anti-hijacking detection systems, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 19140. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to retain the effectiveness of materialmen's and mechanic's liens; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 19141. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase the rates and income limitations relating to payment of pension and parents' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 19142. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical and hospital care through a system of voluntary health insurance financed in whole for low-income groups, through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax credits, and to provide a system of peer review of utilization, charges, and quality of medical service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 19143. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide permanent financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 19144. A bill to create a health security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 19145. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to release on behalf of the United States a condition in a deed conveying certain land to the State of Oregon to be used as a public highway; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 19146. A bill to promote the public welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.J. Res. 1363. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.J. Res. 1364. Joint resolution recognizing the State of Illinois as host in 1992 of the official quinquennial celebration of the discovery of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.J. Res. 1365. Joint resolution authorizing the President to declare one week each September as "National SS Hope Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself and Mr. MEEDS):

H. Con. Res. 723. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to international agreements providing for mandatory extradition of aircraft hijackers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H. Con. Res. 724. Concurrent resolution calling for an international convention on the treatment of airline terrorists and the

nations that give them support and asylum; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAFT:

H. Con. Res. 725. Concurrent resolution for new initiatives at the Paris peace talks including a cease-fire and other matters; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H. Con. Res. 726. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to international aircraft hijacking; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H. Con. Res. 727. Concurrent resolution to create a joint congressional committee to provide Congress with a plan for legislation to deal with the problems of rural America; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Con. Res. 728. Concurrent resolution appealing to Soviets to cease persecution of Jews in Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H. Con. Res. 729. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to international agreements providing for mandatory extradition of aircraft hijackers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. REIFEL, Mr. SIKES, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. BRAY, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. LANGEN, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SCHWENDEL, and Mr. RODINO):

H. Res. 1206. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

H. Res. 1207. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the spreading practice of international hijacking and the kidnapping of diplomatic personnel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 19147. A bill for the relief of Frank Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 19148. A bill for the relief of Lilia C. Sanjur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 19149. A bill for the relief of Nabil George H. Yaldo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 19150. A bill for the relief of Robert W. Patterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 19151. A bill for the relief of Fred Devine, doing business as Fred Devine Diving Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CODORUS STATE PARK

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1970

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, Codorus State Park in my congressional district came into being as the result of

the cooperative efforts of the State of Pennsylvania and the P. H. Glatfelter Co. The State of Pennsylvania has obtained a valuable piece of scenic real estate, the Glatfelter Co. has gained a dependable water reserve, and the people have won an impressive recreational area located in the area I serve.

Because Codorus State Park vividly illustrates what can be done through the

cooperative efforts of State government and private industry, I include in the RECORD an article prepared by the Pennsylvania Department of Forests and Waters on this interesting project, the first of its type in the entire country:

CODORUS STATE PARK

Pennsylvania's Codorus State Park is one of the Commonwealth's most recently acquired acres for the development of outdoor