

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, February 27, 1970, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 26, 1970:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the U.S.

Air Force to the grade indicated, under the provisions of chapters 35 and 837, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. I. G. Brown, XXXX FG, Arkansas Air National Guard.

To be brigadier general

Col. John J. Pesch, xxx-xx-xxxx FG, Maine Air National Guard.

IN THE NAVAL RESERVE

The following named officers of the Naval Reserve for temporary promotion to the

grade of rear admiral subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Paul C. Huelsenbeck Chester C. Hosmer
Ira D. Putnam Samuel W. Van Court

MEDICAL CORPS

Scott Whitehouse

SUPPLY CORPS

Owen C. Pearce

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

John H. McAuliffe

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, February 26, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Karl Applbaum, Avenue "M" Jewish Center, Brooklyn, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, ruler of the universe and creator of mankind, I deem it a great honor and privilege to invoke Thy name in this august body, the Members of the House of Representatives of these United States of America. As these men and women are assembled here to legislate for our country and provide for its welfare, bless them I pray Thee, for they have been selected by their peers to enact the laws by which we live and by which our great democracy functions.

Bless them with strength of character and perseverance of purpose to work on behalf of peace, justice, and prosperity. May they ever be guided by altruistic motives and sincerity. Bless further, I pray Thee, O God, the President of these United States upon whom rests a heavy burden to satisfy all diverse elements in his constituency. The task which he has undertaken is most demanding. He needs Thy help, O God, so that he might steer our ship of state through the turbulent waters of conflict, misunderstanding, war, and inflation, and bring it to the shores of love, understanding, and happiness. And lastly, O God, bless and guide the inhabitants of this land, unite them all, on the right and the left, the young and old, the rich and poor, the sick and well, into a brotherhood of man, to appreciate the beauty of freedom, the greatness of our American heritage nurtured in the Judeo-Christian tradition. May we reject conflict and strife and dwell together in peace and harmony for the betterment of all. May we in our own day see the fulfillment of that ancient Hebrew dream "Hinei mah tov uma noim shevet achim gum yachad"—"How good and sweet it is for brethren to dwell together in harmony." May this decade see the fulfillment of all our dreams—the maturity that is capable of receiving the light and fully assuming the responsibility that Thou dost entrust to us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard,

one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 24, 1970, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 9564. An act to remove the restrictions on the grades of the director and assistant directors of the Marine Corps Band.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11702) entitled "An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve and extend the provisions relating to assistance to medical libraries and related instrumentalities, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14733) entitled "An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the program of assistance for health services for domestic migrant agricultural workers and for other purposes."

RABBI KARL APPLBAUM DELIVERS OPENING PRAYER

(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 House of Representatives was honored today by the presence of Dr. Karl Applbaum, rabbi of the Avenue M Jewish Center in Brooklyn, N.Y., who delivered the opening prayer. Rabbi Applbaum is a resident of Flushing, N.Y. where he is a highly respected leader of the Queens community.

Our distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. HALPERN) had the privilege of inviting Dr. Applbaum to be with us today and I would like to take this opportunity to express the appreciation of the Queens delegation and of my other colleagues in the House for his appearance.

Rabbi Applbaum was born 60 years ago in a small town in Hungary. The Applbaum family—then Apfebaum—boasted a long line of distinguished rabbis, scholars, authors, and philosophers, and Karl began his study of the Bible at the age of 5. In 1930 the family moved

to Brooklyn and today three Applbaum brothers are practicing rabbis while the senior Rabbi Emanuel Applbaum, age 84, continues his work as rabbi of the Avenue M Jewish Center, an outstanding orthodox pulpit in Flatbush.

Dr. Applbaum is an attorney admitted to practice in the State of New York and since 1938 he has served as a supervisor to the Department of Social Services of the City of New York on a number of assignments. Rabbi Applbaum has been quite active in a number of veterans organizations. He has served the Jewish War Veterans as Queens County chaplain since 1962 and has served in a similar capacity to the American Legion, Queens County chapter.

Rabbi Applbaum has been national chaplain to the Reserve Officers Association of the United States after serving the Queens chapter for 20 years. In addition Dr. Applbaum is now serving as president, Long Island chapter of the Association of the U.S. Army.

The list of Rabbi Applbaum's other activities on behalf of Judaism and on behalf of the Queens community is too long to enumerate. I deemed it a privilege and pleasure to have worked with Rabbi Applbaum on a number of community projects during these past 12 years. I have the greatest respect for him and I congratulate him on the completion of 35 years in the rabbinate.

TRIBUTE TO RABBI KARL APPLBAUM

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

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the House has just been privileged to have its opening prayer delivered by Rabbi Dr. Karl Applbaum, an outstanding spiritual leader, a noted constituent, a vigorous and effective community leader in Queens, N.Y., and my beloved friend.

Dr. Applbaum is celebrating his 35th anniversary in the rabbinate this month, and has been honored to deliver the invocation on three previous occasions in the House of Representatives, each time marking an anniversary of Israel.

He is the spiritual leader of the Avenue M Jewish Center in Brooklyn, whose pulpit he has shared for many years with his father, Rabbi Emanuel Applbaum, the senior rabbi of the congregation, who this month is celebrating his 60th anniversary in the rabbinate. This learned spiritual leader, who is honoring us this

morning, is also marking his retirement as chaplain in the U.S. Army Reserve this month, after devoting 25 years to this valuable public service.

It is significant to note that this learned rabbi comes from a family of dedicated rabbis. Indeed his brother Sidney has also had the honor of delivering an invocation in the other body. I should add a meaningful note that this event was simultaneous with the delivery of the opening prayer in this House by our guest today. This unique event of two brothers opening both Houses of Congress with prayers on the same day occurred most significantly on the 18th anniversary of the State of Israel. A third brother, Rabbi Martin L. Applbaum, is the highly respected spiritual leader of the Garden Jewish Center in Flushing.

Under special order later today further tribute will be paid to Dr. Applbaum by me and other colleagues. I will ask unanimous consent that all Members be granted 5 legislative days to include their remarks.

CONDUCT CONTRARY TO MANNERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, an incident occurred in the Congress of the United States on Tuesday last which deserves some comment. The Governor of Georgia in the restaurant of the House of Representatives passed out ax handles. The ax handles presumably hark back to the time when the Governor of Georgia, then a restaurant owner, defied the Congress of the United States by barring from his restaurant American citizens who happen to have black skins. The ax handles presumably are symbols of white supremacy.

Mr. Speaker, this is an abhorrent and offensive concept. And the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS) reminded the Governor that the manners of the House of Representatives do not condone such behavior. When the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS), and another distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), reported this to the House, it was greeted with some derision.

I think Frederick Douglass put it well once when he said:

A gentleman will not insult me, and no man not a gentleman can insult me.

To laugh at the pain and humiliation of a person, after being subjected to something like this, is hardly gentlemanly behavior. We call each other "gentlemen" and I think we should live up to it.

GUNS ON CAPITOL HILL

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with our colleague, Mr. McCARTHY, with respect to what occurred the other day. The conduct of Gov. Lester Maddox of Georgia as directed toward one of our

distinguished Members of this House, CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr., is surely to be deplored by all of us. As a result of the Governor's outrageous remarks, a resolution has been introduced by our colleague to announce that the Governor is no longer welcome as a guest in the House dining room. Because I believe that the citizens of our country, irrespective of whether I like them or not, should never be barred from using the facilities of this Capitol, I will not support the resolution.

But, I do not believe that we can ever tolerate an even graver situation where an armed man, not a member of the Capitol Police force or of the District of Columbia Police force, but in this case a Georgia State Trooper, enters our Capitol with a pistol strapped to his hip. If Governor Maddox believed that his personal security required special police protection, then a Capitol Police officer should have been assigned to him. Just imagine the situation if the 50 Governors of our various States and other visiting dignitaries entered our Capitol Grounds each with a pistol-packing State trooper, sheriff, or guard. It would be intolerable.

I examined the United States Code to determine the extent of the law controlling this subject. Title 40, section 193 of the code proscribes the carriage of weapons on Capitol Grounds by persons other than the Capitol Police. But, I ascertained that the restrictions contained in the United States Code can be relaxed by other regulations and indeed they have been. In 1967 the Architect of the Capitol and the Sergeants at Arms authorized State officers to carry guns on Capitol Grounds. I believe this is a mistake. We ought not have a situation where one can walk through these buildings and suddenly be confronted by someone carrying a gun who is not a member of the Capitol Police Force.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to direct the Architect and the Sergeants at Arms to rescind the regulation so that henceforth no one other than the Capitol Police will be allowed to carry weapons on the Capitol Grounds.

EQUALITY OF RIGHTS UNDER THE LAW

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, this morning several hundred Members of the Congress enjoyed breakfast in the Rayburn Building with the lovely ladies who are the State leaders of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

I know that every Member of the House of Representatives who has visited with these ladies and discussed with them the proposals that they sponsor is very proud of the manner in which they study the national issues and very proud of the way in which they present their points of views on important legislation.

Many of us are cosponsors of the amendment to the Constitution which they have been sponsoring for some time, to provide that equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged

any man or any woman on account of sex.

We are also familiar with the important and very constructive work that they have done in advancing reforms in our tax laws. They were one of the major sponsors of the change affected in the 1969 act which provides for a broadened head-of-household benefit, which was long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for all of my colleagues in welcoming these lovely representatives of the federation to the Capitol and in wishing them well as they advance their programs in the Nation's Capitol.

CONGRESSMAN DON EDWARDS REMARKS ON THE RESOLUTION CONCERNING GOVERNOR MADDOX

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn of the recent display of racism in the House restaurant by Gov. Lester Maddox of Georgia. While I am not surprised by the actions of Governor Maddox, I am surprised that such an incident was allowed here in the Capitol.

Governor Maddox in his action of passing out ax handles made clear his contempt for the Constitution of the United States, his contempt for the laws of this land, his contempt for those who pass the laws, and his contempt for those who rule on the laws of this Nation. In fact Governor Maddox made clear his contempt for law and order, not to mention peace and justice in the United States. Then, surprised that some should object to his contempt, Governor Maddox made clear his hate and prejudice in his comments to the press.

Governor Maddox's actions are a symptom of a growing sickness. It is a sickness which brought laughter to this House, laughter at an insult to this House, and to its Members.

Somehow, within the last 2 years, the dream of American equality and the commitment to that equality has been dying. We are returning to the racism, the blatant racism of the past.

More than a year ago, we started a new administration with a theme of "bring us together," but today we are living in a world of "divide and conquer."

We, here, are Representatives of all the people. We, here, cannot stand by when this House and the laws of the land are insulted. I support the resolution of the gentleman from Michigan, the Honorable CHARLES C. DIGGS. I submit that this House has a responsibility to respond not only to this insult to its honor, but to the problem it represents.

MINIMUM PURCHASE REQUIREMENT FOR TREASURY BILLS LIFTED

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today's ac-

tion by the Treasury lifting the minimum purchase requirement for Treasury bills from \$1,000 to \$10,000 is an arbitrary exercise of discretion to protect the high-interest Treasury bill market for the bankers. It is an action blatantly subservient to the banking industry.

A congressional investigation and study of Federal borrowing is long overdue. The American people have been financially "done in" by public borrowing procedures which have forced the Federal Government to pay the highest interest rates since 1859.

It is shameful to force the average citizen to take a 5-percent interest rate on series E bonds while the banker interest rate on Federal borrowing runs almost 8½ percent. The banker interest rate on Federal securities is almost 70 percent higher than the rate available to average citizens.

The effect of Treasury action on housing interest rates is a myth. The movement of small investors into Federal securities would have the effect of broadening the market for Treasury securities and ultimately reducing the interest rates of Government borrowing which must be at the vanguard of more attractive interest rates for housing.

LET US ACCEPT HANOI'S OFFER TO TRADE "PRISONERS"

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

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I understand that Hanoi has issued a demand that we release the Chicago 7, calling them our prisoners. I urge President Nixon to make Hanoi a counteroffer to trade these seven pro-Communist, revolutionary derelicts for any seven American prisoners they hold. The Chicago 7 would obviously feel more at home in a Communist nation and we would be well rid of them. In exchange, we could get back seven Americans, so everybody would benefit by the exchange.

THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the House that the clock is running out again this Saturday on the continuing resolution under which the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare are operating. All of you know the problems that have been created by the veto message. So far as I know the conference report will not be ready before Saturday night, which is the last day of the month. So, when we return here to work on Monday, those two Departments are going to be operating some \$19 billion worth of programs with no appropriation. I do not know what the final outcome is going to be. However, I would like the House to know that we are in a very serious crisis.

More important, there are some 35,000 school districts all over this country whose school administrators have no idea

how they are going to complete the last 4 months of this fiscal year.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a serious problem, and I think the Members of the House ought to be apprised of it.

BIRTHDAY OF THE LATE JOSEPH A. YABLONSKI

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Joseph A. Yablonski was born on March 3, 1910. His 60th birthday would have been next Tuesday. On Sunday afternoon at 2 p.m. at the Park Junior High School in Beckley, W. Va., south of Charleston, we will hold a memorial tribute to the late Joseph A. Yablonski. I invite my colleagues to attend what will be, not a mournful meeting, but a meeting to express our determination to carry on the work which Joseph A. Yablonski so courageously started in the mines of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, you can kill a man, but you cannot kill an ideal.

Next Tuesday, on what would have been the 60th birthday of this great American who did so much for the miners, I am going to ask for a special order to pay tribute to Mr. Yablonski, and point out his goals and accomplishments, and the challenge he left in his unfinished work which we must carry on.

IRS LISTING NAMES OF GUN COLLECTORS

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the Internal Revenue Service of the United States is currently selling a listing comprised of 140,000 names and addresses of the licensed gun dealers and collectors of the United States of America. I can think of no greater transgression on an honorable profession, of those people who seek to legally collect guns or legally sell guns to people who desire them, and know how to use them, than this current practice.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to suggest to the Internal Revenue Department that in lieu of publishing these names they buy several billboards on the main highways where they cannot only display the names of an honest gun collector, but carry a picture of his home, and a picture of the gun collector, so that every thief—and I repeat—every thief in this Nation will know where to look, not only by name and address, but by description of the house and a picture of the man who honestly bought the guns and collects them.

From time to time, Mr. Speaker, we wonder why we pass laws trying to protect the private citizen in a legitimate occupation. In my estimation the occupation of a gun collector is a hobby, and I do not see any reason why the Internal Revenue Service should be permitted to sell the names of 140,000 of honest people to indiscriminate purchasers.

The best way for Communist organs or agents to obtain the listing is with the sum of \$140, to write to the Internal Revenue Service to obtain the list.

This, to me, is deplorable and I intend to introduce legislation prohibiting the Internal Revenue Service or any other governmental agency from carrying out this despicable listing and sale of names and addresses of people that can be used against them. I shall also demand the names and addresses of the 60 persons who have already purchased the listing.

CRAMER CALLS FOR KUNSTLER PROBE UNDER CRAMER ANTIRIOT ACT

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have called upon the Justice Department today to investigate possible antiriot law violations by the "Chicago 7" defense attorney, William Kunstler.

Kunstler urged Chicago 7 protestors in Santa Barbara, Calif., yesterday to take to the streets—and they did. More than 800 protestors surged through the streets near the University of California, throwing rocks and bottles, overturning a police car, and burning a bank until only a gutted skeleton remained.

As author of the Federal law making it a criminal offense to cross State lines or use interstate facilities to incite a violent civil disturbance, I am deeply concerned by Mr. Kunstler's activities. Mr. Kunstler's actions seem to be a clear violation of the Antiriot Act. Although already sentenced to 4 years in jail for contempt of court in Chicago, Mr. Kunstler has been allowed to remain free for the sole purpose of preparing his clients' appeals.

Instead, he has used this time to make speeches around the country protesting the jury's verdict. He has urged people to take to the streets—and he said that if this does not get action, they should exercise their "right to revolution."

I have already urged Judge Julius J. Hoffman to jail Mr. Kunstler for continuing to violate his contempt citation by inciting demonstrations and preaching the "right of revolution," which does not exist.

Mr. Kunstler is the carrier of the deadly disease of anarchy and disorder, and he is spreading it around our Nation with disastrous results. Clearly, Mr. Kunstler cannot be allowed to remain free.

In Washington, on February 21, Mr. Kunstler told a group at a protest rally:

There isn't anything that's going to change anything in this country unless the people are in the streets.

In the resulting demonstration, 112 were arrested as they and many others took to the streets.

SECOND SEIZURE OF U.S. FISHING VESSEL OFF LATIN AMERICA THIS WEEK

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, Ecuador today seized the American fishing vessel *Day Island*, and has taken her, illegally, into the Port of Guayaquil. Only last Monday, Peru seized the tuna vessel *Western King* and forced a payment of \$15,072 before permitting its release from port.

To add to this growing and tragic story, on February 14, Ecuador seized the tuna vessel *City of Panama* about 17 miles off the Ecuadorian coast. Before being released, the vessel had to pay a total of \$49,650.

Mr. Speaker, these incidents are evidence to me that these Latin American countries are not serious in reaching a settlement at the bargaining table over our differences. Accordingly, I have no course but to continue to seek Navy or Coast Guard protection for our fleet.

Second, I shall request through legislation new and stronger measures with regard to trade sanctions and other means to show that Americans will not stand for these acts of piracy against her citizens on the high seas.

These are Americans citizens, Mr. Speaker, and they are working under the U.S. flag in international waters. The time for talking has been offered and spurned. It is time now for more positive action to halt these crimes against Americans.

QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—BYFORD AGAINST MEISEL, McNARY, AND ICHORD

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I have been served with a summons to appear before the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern Division, as a defendant in the case of Byford against Meisel, McNary, and Ichord—Civil Action No. 70C 58(1). Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with the summons without the permission of the House, the privileges of the House being involved.

I therefore send the summons to the desk for the consideration of this body.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

[U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern Division]

SUMMONS

Charles Byford, Plaintiff v. Lawrence Meisel, Gene McNary, Richard Ichord (as an individual), Defendants.)

To the above named Defendants:

You are hereby summoned and required to serve upon Charles H. Byford, whose address is 4521 Belle-Wood Drive, St. Louis County, Mo., 63125, an answer to the complaint which is herewith served upon you, within 20 days after service of this summons upon you, exclusive of the day of service. If you fail to do so, judgment by default will be taken against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.

HAROLD G. PRYCE,
Clerk of Court.
ANNICE W. KINDER,
Deputy Clerk.

Date: February 6, 1970.

AMENDING NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 11651) to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to provide funds and authorities to the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of providing free or reduced-price meals to needy children not now being reached, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1752) is amended by inserting after section 13 the following new section:

"TEMPORARY EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE TO PROVIDE NUTRITIOUS MEALS TO NEEDY CHILDREN IN SCHOOLS

"SEC. 13A. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, under such terms and conditions as he deems in the public interest, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to use an additional amount, not to exceed \$30,000,000, of funds from section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c), to supplement funds heretofore made available to carry out programs during the fiscal year 1970 to improve the nutrition of needy children in public and nonprofit private schools participating in the national school lunch program under this Act or the school breakfast program under the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.)."

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

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I want my colleagues to know that this bill reduces the amount of money from \$100 million down to \$30 million, to be appropriated from section 32 funds in order that we might finance school lunch programs to provide lunches for needy children in States where they will run short of funds before the end of this school year.

Mr. Speaker, I have a chart compiled by the Department of Agriculture which illustrates the amount of money—\$23,594,205—that is needed at this time:

U.S. Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Service—State agencies' requests for additional funds for free or reduced price lunches as of February 6, 1970, over amounts allocated for fiscal year 1970

Alabama	\$1,200,000
California	569,236
Colorado	37,607
Connecticut	25,352
Delaware	11,060
Florida	1,889,998
Georgia	2,685,829
Illinois	3,995,763
Indiana	112,067
Iowa	176,308
Kentucky	234,665
Maine	336,495
Maryland	1,030,864
Massachusetts	\$26,853
Michigan	24,366
Minnesota	80,132
Missouri	121,225
Montana	15,166
New Hampshire	11,492
New Jersey	301,872
New Mexico	78,800
New York	5,313,112

North Carolina	13,738
Oklahoma	1,100,538
Oregon	60,671
Pennsylvania	145,800
Rhode Island	34,433
South Carolina	612,228
Tennessee	263,180
Utah	59,251
Vermont	19,935
Virginia	948,408
Washington	292,780
West Virginia	1,764,981

Total 23,594,205

I believe we ought to accept the amended bill as it is late in the year and the funds are desperately needed. This legislation will take care of the needs at this time and I think it is in line with the idea the gentleman from Kentucky and I had. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky for any comments he may wish to make.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, that this is the bill he and I jointly sponsored to provide an additional amount of \$100 million for needy children for free school lunches throughout America, because we thought at the time that the school lunch program was inadequately funded.

Mr. Speaker, we passed the bill earlier, and the Senate took action only a few days ago, after the Department made it known there was an emergency in several States of the Union.

I agree with the gentleman from Minnesota that at this late hour we should agree to the Senate amendment in order that some of the schoolchildren most in need throughout America will have the opportunity to receive free or reduced-price meals.

Mr. Speaker, I am not satisfied with the surveys that have been made by USDA; particularly for my home State of Kentucky.

I notice here that my home State will need only \$234,665 out of the \$23,594,000 that USDA states is needed for emergency situations.

I really believe that the survey from Kentucky is an inaccurate survey and that at a later date it will be found that more money may be necessary. If that be the case in Kentucky and other States I am sure the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, who has contributed so much toward feeding the needy children throughout America by cosponsoring this bill will join me, in sponsoring a new bill to make sure that there are enough funds to feed the children most in need throughout America.

I include a number of documents from USDA and other sources which indicate a need for more than this bill can meet:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

Washington, D.C., February 25, 1970.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PERKINS: Enclosed are some tables reflecting the accomplishments resulting from the use of special assistance funds for the child feeding programs, provided from Section 32, for the fiscal years 1969 and 1970.

We are also enclosing a description of program gains in a number of individual child programs resulting from the use of the special assistance funds.

While the 1970 fiscal year is not yet over

it has become increasingly apparent in recent weeks that a number of States are experiencing a shortage of Federal funds for the support of free and reduced price lunches. We have contacted each of the States and obtained estimates of their needs. These requests total \$23,594,205. In addition, the States have requested nearly \$7 million in additional breakfast and equipment funds.

Thank you for your continued support of our food and nutrition programs.

Sincerely,

RICHARD LYNG,
Assistant Secretary.

NSLP

Free or reduced price lunches

	3-month period	Monthly average
September, October, November 1968 (fiscal year 1969).....	127,041,224	42,347,074
March, April, May 1969 (fiscal year 1969).....	196,580,954	65,526,984
September, October, November 1969 (fiscal year 1970).....	201,103,860	67,034,620
March to May 1969 increase over September to November 1968.....	69,539,730	23,179,910
September to November increase over September to November 1968.....	74,062,636	24,687,545

Free or reduced price lunches averaged over 42.3 million monthly prior to the availability of Section 32 funds in FY 1969. The number of free or reduced-price lunches increased nearly 55% to a monthly average of 65.5 million during the first half year in which Section 32 funds were available.

The rate of increase slowed in the first half of FY 1970 to an average increase of 1.5 million children over the close of the prior fiscal and school year. The predominant reason given by States for this slowdown was the uncertainty of how much Federal money would be available caused by the late passage of appropriations by Congress. States report they are increasing activity toward reaching poor children with free or reduced-price lunches during the second half of FY 1970.

SCHOOL BREAKFAST

Fiscal year 1969	Child Nutrition Act	Section 32	Total
Total breakfasts served.....	24,152,257	14,917,783	39,070,040
Free breakfasts served.....	16,593,163	11,323,104	27,916,267
Federal reimbursement.....	\$3,337,165	\$1,932,766	\$5,450,000

Over 60% more breakfasts—or 14.9 million—were served as a result of Section 32 funds during FY 1969. These could not have been Federally reimbursed had it not been for Section 32 funds since nearly all Child Nutrition Act money for breakfasts was used.

However, Ohio, Kentucky and Puerto Rico account for over 75% of the Section 32 funds used for the breakfasts reimbursed from this fund.

NONFOOD ASSISTANCE

Fiscal year 1969	Child Nutrition Act	Section 32	Total
Number of schools.....	833	4,700	5,533
Federal funds used.....	\$750,000	\$9,577,722	\$10,338,722

Most schools which furnished or improved kitchen facilities during FY 1969 did so with Section 32 funds. Nearly \$9.6 million of Section 32 were used above the \$750,000 apportioned under the Child Nutrition Act.

Benefits from these expenditures should be reaped in FY 1970 and later through expanded facilities or addition of a lunch program in a previously non-lunch program school.

EXAMPLES OF PROGRAM EXPANSION USING SECTION 32 FUNDS

City of Chicago

It is estimated that more than 116,000 children in Chicago are now receiving free lunches—a ten-fold increase over the previous year. It is estimated \$3.3 million dollars

in Federal funds will be needed to provide free lunches for an additional 35,000 participants. The State of Illinois made \$5.4 million available to supplement Federal funds.

City of Philadelphia

During fiscal year 1969 lunch programs were extended to 35 additional needy schools from central commissary facilities. The number increased to 72 schools this year. About one-third are served from a central kitchen or from other schools and approximately 11-100 free lunches are served daily in the City of Philadelphia.

The City provided \$750,000 to supplement Federal funds. The State Agency allocated \$185,000 of Federal funds for additional equipment.

City of Baltimore

During fiscal year 1970 every Baltimore school, for the first time, has some food service available. During the week of October 6, free lunches were served daily to 29,251 children—a sixfold increase over the previous year.

Bag lunches are being prepared in 18 centers to serve 11,000 children in 66 satellite schools. State funds have been made available in the amount of \$1.2 million. The City made \$500,000 available to supplement the State contribution.

Indianapolis, Indiana

This month Indianapolis has 13 schools in its satellite feeding program. Lunches are being served to 4,000 children daily. It is expected by March 17 that 27 schools will be serving 9,000 to 10,000 children per day.

Last year there was no program in Indianapolis.

City of Camden, New Jersey

In Camden, plans are going forward to expand the lunch program to 24 city elementary schools. An old building had to be renovated to prepare the 11,000 lunches they expect to serve daily.

The City of Camden furnished approximately \$300,000 and the State Agency reserved \$32,000 of equipment funds to assist in getting the program started.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, FISCAL YEARS 1969-71

Program	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 budget estimated	1971 budget, compared with 1970
A. Child nutrition programs:				
1. Cash grants to States:				
(a) School lunch (section), direct appropriation.....	\$162,034	\$168,041	\$169,721	+\$1,680
(b) Free and reduced price lunches:				
Child nutrition program.....	10,000	44,800	48,347	+3,547
Special feeding program (sec. 32).....	32,039	61,000	151,653	+90,653
Subtotal.....	42,039	105,800	200,000	+94,200
(c) School breakfast:				
Child nutrition programs.....	3,500	10,000	12,000	+2,000
Special feeding program (sec. 32).....	2,057	1,000	3,000	+2,000
Subtotal.....	5,557	11,000	15,000	+4,000
(d) Nonfood assistance:				
Child nutrition programs.....	748	10,000	12,500	+ ,500
Special feeding programs (sec. 32).....	9,513	5,000	-5,000
Subtotal.....	10,261	15,000	12,500	-2,500
(e) State administrative expenses:				
Child nutrition programs.....	153	750	750
Special feeding programs (sec. 32).....	391	2,000	2,000
Subtotal.....	391	2,750	2,750
(f) Nonschool food programs.....	3,244	13,572	15,000	+1,428
Total, cash grants to States.....	223,679	316,163	414,971	+98,808
A. Child nutrition program—Continued				
2. Commodities to States:				
(a) School lunch (sec. 6).....	63,899	64,325	64,325
(b) Sec. 32.....	121,202	129,004	75,267	-53,737
(c) Sec. 416 (CCC stocks).....	107,006	35,826	124,873	+88,047
Total, commodities.....	292,107	230,205	264,465	+34,260
3. Federal operating expenses:				
(a) Child nutrition programs.....	2,510	3,850	4,110	+260
(b) Sec. 32 (expenses for commodity donations).....	1,485	1,432	1,432
Total, operating expenses.....	3,995	5,282	5,542	+260
Total, child nutrition programs.....	519,781	551,650	684,978	+133,328
B. Special milk program:				
1. Special milk program.....	\$102,048	\$83,314	-\$83,314
2. Special feeding programs (sec. 32).....	20,000	-20,000
3. Operating expenses.....	629	686	-686
Total, special milk.....	102,677	104,000	-104,000
C. Food stamp program:				
1. Food stamp.....	240,587	596,150	\$1,232,000	+635,850
2. Operating expenses.....	10,395	13,850	18,000	+4,150
Total, food stamp program.....	250,982	610,000	1,250,000	+640,000
D. Direct distribution to families:				
1. Sec. 32 commodities.....	190,282	189,304	157,475	-31,829
2. Sec. 416 commodities (CCC stocks).....	79,278	51,942	92,745	+40,803
3. Financial Assistance to States (sec. 32).....	4,154	16,000	19,700	+3,700

See footnote at end of table.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, FISCAL YEARS 1969-71—Continued

Program	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 budget estimated	1971 budget, compared with 1970	Program	1969 actual	1970 estimated	1971 budget estimated	1971 budget, compared with 1970
D. Direct distribution families—Continued					3. Operating expenses.....	122	40	34	-6
4. Nutrition supplement (special packages):					Total, direct distribution to institutions.....	32,227	12,889	26,416	+13,527
(a) Special feeding program sec. 32.....	1,000	11,000	29,405	+18,405	F. Nutrition education (extension service including administrative expenses).....	9,948	30,000	50,000	+20,000
(b) Sec. 32 commodities.....	7,067	21,655	9,700	-11,955	Total, food assistance.....	1,201,332	1,603,814	2,324,139	+720,325
(c) Sec. 416 commodities.....	(500)	(3,855)	(7,393)	(-+3,538)	Recapitulation:				
Total, nutrition supplement.....	8,067	32,655	39,105	+6,450	Direct appropriations (including transfers authorized in annual Appropriation Acts).....	1,609,695	1,039,338	1,626,753	+543,323
5. Operating expenses (sec. 32).....	3,936	5,374	3,720	-1,654	Special feeding programs (sec. 32).....	45,000	100,000	186,058	+86,058
Total, direct distribution to families.....	285,717	295,275	312,745	+17,470	Sec. 32 (commodities and related expenses).....	339,995	366,619	268,794	-53,733
E. Direct distribution to institutions:					Sec. 416 commodities.....	206,642	97,857	242,534	+144,677
1. Sec. 32 commodities.....	11,747	3,760	1,466	-2,294	Total.....	1,101,332	1,603,814	2,324,139	+720,325
2. Sec. 416 commodities (CCC stocks).....	20,358	9,089	24,916	+15,827					

¹ Includes \$9,948,000 allotted from sec. 32 to extension service for the nutrition education program.

SUMMARY NO. 1 (AMERICAN SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION)

State	Children qualifying for free or reduced price meals	Children receiving free or reduced price meals	State	Children qualifying for free or reduced price meals	Children receiving free or reduced price meals
Alabama.....	(¹)	(¹)	Kansas.....	54,271	25,000
Alaska.....	15,000	11,400	Kentucky.....	(¹)	104,096
Arizona.....	49,141	27,542	Louisiana.....	128,303	128,303
Arkansas.....	66,683	42,727	Maine.....	55,000	17,000
California.....	500,000	160,000	Maryland.....	97,373	49,210
Colorado.....	37,000	25,741	Massachusetts.....	171,138	66,325
Connecticut.....	4,067	3,961	Michigan.....	211,521	101,138
Delaware.....	4,067	3,961	Minnesota.....	106,832	39,055
District of Columbia.....	28,300	28,000	Mississippi.....	(¹)	(¹)
Florida.....	246,275	198,441	Missouri.....	71,696	62,251
Georgia.....	243,239	172,135	Montana.....	18,000	7,000
Hawaii.....	13,400	10,800	Nebraska.....	44,327	17,337
Idaho.....	15,814	4,800	Nevada.....	(¹)	(¹)
Illinois.....	200,000	147,000	New Hampshire.....	9,300	3,720
Indiana.....	98,421	26,060	New Jersey.....	200,000	54,000
Iowa.....	95,000	24,456	New Mexico.....	64,500	41,458
			New York.....	650,000	405,000
			North Carolina.....	484,600	198,672
			North Dakota.....	27,587	(¹)
			Ohio.....		155,599
			Oklahoma.....		103,290
			Oregon.....		40,361
			Pennsylvania.....		178,000
			Rhode Island.....		16,000
			South Carolina.....		208,528
			South Dakota.....		(¹)
			Tennessee.....		218,062
			Texas.....		500,000
			Utah.....		25,000
			Vermont.....		11,773
			Virginia.....		189,953
			Washington.....		125,000
			West Virginia.....		119,374
			Wisconsin.....		84,301
			Wyoming.....		71,225
			Total.....		6,053,254
					3,377,005

¹ Not available.

SUMMARY NO. 2.—ANTICIPATED MONEYS NEEDED BEYOND FISCAL YEAR 1970 APPROPRIATED FUNDS TO CARRY ON SCHOOL FEEDING PROGRAMS FOR THE REST OF FISCAL YEAR 1970 SCHOOL YEAR

State	Sec. 4	Sec. 11	Sec. 32	Breakfast	Nonfood assistance	Total	State	Sec. 4	Sec. 11	Sec. 32	Breakfast	Nonfood assistance	Total
Alabama.....	0	0	\$1,200,000	0	0	\$1,200,000	Nebraska ¹	\$20,000	0	\$100,000	0	0	\$120,000
Alaska.....	0	0	11,000	0	0	11,000	Nevada.....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona.....	0	\$245,884	225,874	\$50,346	\$75,000	\$500,000	New Hampshire.....	0	\$12,000	42,000	0	0	\$54,000
Arkansas.....	\$280,500	0	150,000	0	0	\$430,500	New Jersey.....	0	\$16,326	353,736	\$50,613	0	\$420,675
California.....	12,000,000	0	1,200,000	0	0	\$13,200,000	New Mexico.....	0	0	80,000	0	\$45,000	\$125,000
Colorado.....	0	0	351,000	0	50,000	\$401,000	New York.....	10,000,000	0	5,300,000	0	0	\$15,300,000
Connecticut.....	0	0	50,000	0	0	\$50,000	North Carolina.....	1,981,481	0	5,504,114	750,000	0	\$8,235,595
Delaware.....	0	0	11,000	0	0	\$11,000	North Dakota.....	0	0	0	0	0	0
District of Columbia.....	200,000	320,000	100,000	154,000	10,000	\$784,000	Ohio.....	0	0	215,250	0	150,000	\$365,250
Florida.....	0	0	3,880,000	0	0	\$3,880,000	Oklahoma.....	51,774	506,032	544,759	115,014	63,000	\$1,280,579
Georgia.....	1,920,000	0	2,008,229	0	200,000	\$4,128,229	Oregon.....	174,401	60,000	100,000	0	0	\$334,401
Hawaii.....	250,000	0	30,000	0	0	\$280,000	Pennsylvania.....	0	0	453,800	0	0	\$453,800
Idaho.....	44,056	220,240	0	0	50,000	\$314,296	Rhode Island.....	0	0	34,000	0	0	\$34,000
Illinois.....	557,676	0	4,559,377	0	0	\$5,117,053	South Carolina.....	0	0	612,228	0	0	\$612,228
Indiana.....	100,000	0	350,000	0	0	\$450,000	South Dakota.....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Iowa.....	500,000	60,000	500,000	0	250,000	\$1,310,000	Tennessee.....	0	0	527,702	0	0	\$527,702
Kansas.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	Texas.....	0	0	1,500,000	0	0	\$1,500,000
Kentucky.....	215,000	114,000	0	2,200,000	0	\$2,529,000	Utah.....	424,000	54,563	27,335	0	43,257	\$549,155
Louisiana.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	Vermont.....	131,643	0	69,775	0	6,500	\$207,918
Maine.....	0	0	336,500	0	30,000	\$366,500	Virginia.....	306,720	1,442,163	31,383	0	200,000	\$1,980,266
Maryland.....	115,000	0	1,030,864	5,000	0	\$1,150,864	Washington.....	200,000	0	400,000	0	100,000	\$700,000
Massachusetts.....	42,000	125,000	60,000	0	0	\$227,000	West Virginia.....	1,000,000	764,981	1,000,000	182,000	10,000	\$2,956,981
Michigan.....	0	0	400,000	0	100,000	\$500,000	Wisconsin.....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minnesota.....	0	0	100,000	0	75,000	\$175,000	Wyoming.....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mississippi.....	0	0	0	0	0	0							
Missouri.....	175,000	205,000	0	100,000	0	\$480,000							
Montana.....	30,000	60,000	0	0	0	\$90,000							
							Total.....	30,719,251	4,706,189	33,449,926	3,606,973	1,457,757	\$73,940,096

¹ Georgia: Sec. 4 schools need an additional 3 cents reimbursement.

² Hawaii: An additional \$250,000 for sec. 4 would be required annually to improve the lunches for all children.

³ Kentucky: Reported the growth of the school breakfast program. In August 1968, 22,000 children were served. In October 1969, 908,000 children were served breakfasts.

⁴ Louisiana: It is believed that all needy children determined eligible are reached with the free and/or reduced price meals.

⁵ Maine: Unless these funds are provided by Mar. 1, approximately 16,000 needy children will have to be dropped from the school lunch program.

⁶ Mississippi: The school situation is constantly changing. Based on the situation on Feb. 13, 1970, present funding is adequate.

⁷ Missouri: Each month shows a great increase in participation of needy children.

⁸ Nebraska: If we were to pay 12 cents on each free lunch served in the sec. 4 program, an additional \$20,000 would be needed. If additional funds were available for sec. 32, more schools and children could be qualified for free or reduced price meals.

⁹ Texas: By no means will \$1,500,000 be sufficient to furnish free lunches to 370,000 children not now being served. The sum will permit us to add 50,000 to 60,000 children the last 3 months.

¹⁰ Virginia: The additional funds requested are minimum to carry our present program for the remainder of the school year and provides nothing for expansion. If additional funds are not provided in the immediate future, reimbursement rates will have to be lowered and there is a possibility that some schools will have to close operation and close their lunchroom doors.

APPENDIX B.—Tentative State Needs for Additional School Lunch Money To Feed Poor Children

[In thousands]

Alabama	\$1,200
Alaska	11
Arizona	(1)
Arkansas	150
California	1,200
Colorado	350
Connecticut	50
Delaware	11
District of Columbia	(1)
Florida	3,880
Georgia	2,000
Hawaii	25
Idaho	220
Illinois	4,560
Indiana	350
Iowa	500-750
Kansas	(2)
Kentucky	1,000
Louisiana	(2)
Maine	337
Maryland	1,031
Massachusetts	230
Michigan	400
Minnesota	100
Mississippi	400
Missouri	305
Montana	25
Nebraska	100
Nevada	(2)
New Hampshire	12
New Jersey	350
New Mexico	80
New York	5,300
North Carolina	918
North Dakota	(2)
Ohio	215.3
Oklahoma	1,279
Oregon	100
Pennsylvania	453.8
Rhode Island	34
South Carolina	612
South Dakota	(2)
Tennessee	528
Texas	1,000
Utah	505.9
Vermont	70
Virginia	2,000
Washington	400
West Virginia	1,700
Wisconsin	(2)
Wyoming	(1)

Total 34,243,000.0

¹ Unknown.

² Sufficient.

I believe the gentleman will agree with me that the record discloses since we tapped these funds a year ago and made \$50 million available over a year ago the free and reduced-price school lunches have increased more than 25 percent throughout America. Is that correct?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct. I believe we can be proud of the work that has been done. We are certainly aware that young children can gain in their education and develop their physical needs as well as their mental needs if these diets are adequate.

I would also say that no Members should confuse this bill with another more publicized bill for school lunches just passed by the other body earlier this week. That bill H.R. 515 was passed by the House last year, and was reported out of the Senate committee as S. 2548. The Senate amended that bill and then substituted their language and passed it H.R. 515.

I ask the gentleman from Kentucky: Does he plan to go to conference on that legislation?

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to my dis-

tinguished colleague, in reference to the legislation before the House now, the Senate has waived the formula in the present school lunch program and given the Department of Agriculture full flexibility. We have given them a free hand in expending the money where they say the emergencies exist throughout America.

The other bill, of course, will come at a later date. I am sure we on the House side will have a discussion to see how we can best work it out.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for those comments.

I am glad to see we have the Department of Agriculture agreement with us on this particular bill.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I should like to congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) for his expeditious handling of this bill.

I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota for assisting on this legislation.

I should like to thank the House, for the 116,000 children in the city of Chicago who will be able to get hot lunches from this legislation. This is forward looking legislation. We can all be proud of it.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DEVINE. 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. 32]

Ashley	Green, Oreg.	Rees
Baring	Green, Pa.	Reifel
Berry	Hagan	Riegle
Brook	Hanna	Rosenthal
Brooks	Hays	St Germain
Brown, Calif.	Jarman	Scherle
Buchanan	Kirwan	Scheuer
Camp	Langen	Schneebeli
Celler	Leggett	Stafford
Chisholm	Lennon	Steed
Clark	McEwen	Stratton
Clay	Meskill	Stuckey
Culver	Mikva	Symington
Dawson	Morton	Taft
Dellenback	Moss	Teague, Calif.
Dickinson	O'Hara	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	Ottinger	Thompson, N.J.
Edwards, La.	Pepper	Tunney
Esch	Pettis	Watson
Ford	Pike	Whitehurst
William D. Fuqua	Powell	
	Rarick	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 368 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

SEVENTH REPORT ON COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE ACT OF 1962—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-264)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

On July 20, 1969, from the Oval Office in the White House, I spoke by telephone with Neil Armstrong and Edwin Aldrin on the surface of the Moon. This historic event was simultaneously televised to the world through the medium of communication satellites. Under Section 404(a) of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962, I am sending to the Congress this seventh report on the program that helped bring this historic event to millions of people throughout the world.

Communications between Earth and the Moon, while certainly the most dramatic use, is only one of many ways in which satellite communications can now be employed. The Intelsat Consortium of more than 70 nations has been highly successful in bringing the benefits of communications satellite technology to the people of many nations. This report reflects the steady progress being made toward an improved global communications network. Already we see major improvements in international telecommunications capabilities—improvements that will ultimately benefit all of the world's people.

The Communications Satellite Act speaks of the contribution to be made to "world peace and understanding" by a commercial communications satellite system. Just as this technology has enabled men to speak to each other across the boundary of outer space, so, I am convinced, satellite communications will in future years help men to understand one another better across boundaries of a political, linguistic and social nature. World peace and understanding are goals worthy of this new and exciting means of communication.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 26, 1970.

NINTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-262)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

It is with a sense of gratification that I transmit to the Congress the Ninth Annual Report of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The events of the past year have shown that through negotiation we can move toward the control of armaments in a manner that will bring a greater measure of security than we can obtain from arms alone.

There is reason to be hopeful of the possibility that an understanding can be reached with the Soviet Union which will permit both nations to reduce the burden and danger of competitive development of strategic arms.

The process has begun. The preliminary, exploratory phase of the Strategic Arms Limitations Talks was held in Helsinki in November and December. Ambassador Gerard Smith, the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, whom I named to head our delegation to the Talks, reported to me that the exchange of views was serious and augured well for the next phase to begin in Vienna in April.

We have undertaken these negotiations because it is in our interest to do so. We believe the Soviet Union recognizes a similar interest. In addition, continuing technological advances in weapons systems give warning that delay will only complicate the arduous task of achieving agreements.

The other nations of the world are looking to the United States and the Soviet Union to limit and reduce our strategic arsenals. I believe that a verifiable agreement which will limit arms on both sides will in fact enhance mutual security.

The report which I now send to you describes the contribution of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to the preparation for, and the conduct of negotiations on strategic arms limitation. The report also describes efforts in pursuit of other arms control measures directed to controlling chemical warfare and bacteriological research, to bringing the non-proliferation treaty into effect and to banning nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction from the seabed.

In transmitting this report, I reaffirm my Administration's concern with the substance rather than the rhetoric of arms control. Wherever possible, consistent with our national security, I want our talents, our energies and our wealth to be dedicated, not to destruction, but to improving the quality of life for all our people.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 26, 1970.

PROPOSED FEDERAL ECONOMY ACT OF 1970—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-263)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I propose reduction, termination or restructuring of 57 programs which are obsolete, low priority or in need of basic reform. These program changes would save a total of \$2.5 billion in the fiscal

year 1971. Of this amount, \$1.1 billion savings require Congressional action—roughly the equivalent of the amount by which the 1971 budget is in surplus.

No government program should be permitted to have a life of its own, immune from periodic review of its effectiveness and its place in our list of national priorities.

Too often in the past, "sacred cows" that have outlived their usefulness or need drastic revamping have been perpetuated because of the influence of special interest groups. Others have hung on because they were "too small" to be worthy of attention.

At a time when every dollar of government spending must be scrutinized, we cannot afford to let mere inertia drain away our resources.

Some of these programs are the objects of great affection by the groups they benefit. But when they no longer serve the general public interest, they must be repealed or reformed.

No program should be too small to escape scrutiny; a small item may be termed a "drop in the bucket" of a \$200.8 billion budget, but these drops have a way of adding up. Every dollar was sent to the Treasury by some taxpayer who has a right to demand that it be well spent.

As an extreme example, the government since 1897 has had a special board of tasters. At one time in the dim past, there may have been good reason to single out tea for such special taste tests; but that reason no longer exists. Nevertheless, a separate tastering board has gone right along, at the taxpayer's expense, because nobody up to now took the trouble to take a hard look at why it was in existence. The general attitude was: It did not cost much, it provided a few jobs, so why upset the teacart?

That attitude should have no place in this government. The taxpayer's dollar deserves to be treated with more respect.

Most of these programs have the strong support of some special interest group, and in many cases the changes I am proposing will be resisted. Overcoming this resistance will not be easy. I urge, therefore, that the Congress examine the possibilities of establishing special arrangements for consideration of this legislation. The Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures may be able to provide the focus needed to secure the savings I have included in this Federal Economy Act; or, perhaps, a joint select committee empowered to propose legislation to both Houses should be established.

This Administration is making extraordinary efforts to hold down spending; it would be fitting for the Congress to approach the need for economies in the same spirit.

Of the 57 savings actions I have proposed to prune the 1971 fiscal year budget and slow down the momentum of Federal spending, forty-three are within the authority of the President to effect; four are already before the Congress and awaiting action; ten more are submitted with the Federal Economy Act.

Of the total savings effort, these are the most significant items:

1. *I propose that we reform assistance to schools in Federally-impacted areas to meet more equitably the actual burden of Federal installations.*

In origin this program made good sense: Where a Federal installation such as an Army base existed in an area, and the children of the families living on that installation went to a local school; and when the parents made no contribution to the tax base of the local school district, the Federal government agreed to reimburse the local district for the cost of educating the extra children.

But this impacted aid program, in its twenty years of existence, has been twisted out of shape. No longer is it limited to payments to schools serving children of parents who live on Federal property; 70% of the Federal payments to schools are now for children of Federal employees who live off base and pay local property taxes. In addition, the presence of a Federal installation (much sought-after by many communities) lifts the entire economy of a district. As a result, additional school aid is poured into relatively wealthy communities, when much poorer communities have far greater need for assistance.

One stark fact underscores this inequity: Nearly twice as much Federal money goes into the nation's wealthiest county through this program as goes into the one hundred poorest counties combined.

The new Impact Aid legislation will tighten eligibility requirements, eliminating payments to districts where Federal impact is small. As it reduces payments to the wealthier districts, it will reallocate funds to accord more with the financial needs of eligible districts. Children whose parents live on Federal property would be given greater weight than children whose parents only work on Federal property.

While saving money for the nation's taxpayers, the new plan would direct Federal funds to the school districts in greatest need—considering both their income level and the Federal impact upon their schools.

Reform of this program—which would make it fair once again to all the American people—would save \$392 million in fiscal year 1971 appropriations.

2. *Medicaid.* The original purpose of this program was to provide medical treatment to all persons, regardless of age, who could not afford such care. As many States have discovered, an additional item—long-term residential care in nursing homes and mental hospitals that often involves little medical treatment—has been an unexpected cause of great expense. I propose that we direct Federal matching funds toward medical treatment rather than custodial care and provide new incentives to the States to emphasize more efficient forms of extended care.

Estimated savings to the Federal government in fiscal 1971 appropriations would be \$235 million.

3. *Space research.* After the recent successful Apollo missions, scientific needs for more manned lunar explorations were reassessed. We concluded that fewer manned expeditions to the moon were needed, and production of addi-

tional Saturn V launch vehicles and spacecraft has been suspended. Eight Saturn Vs remain in our inventory for manned flights during the early 70s. Savings as a result of these and related space research decisions total \$417 million in fiscal year 1971 appropriations.

4. *Duplicated veterans benefits.* During the past twenty years, Social Security and other legislation has been enacted which often duplicates benefits due to veterans with wartime service to defray burial expenses. I have proposed to limit Veterans Administration payments to the difference between \$250 and the total of non-VA benefits due the veteran's survivors, saving \$54 million in fiscal year 1971.

In addition, I propose to require insurance companies to reimburse the Veterans Administration for the general hospital care of veterans with non-service connected medical problems who have purchased private health insurance but who elected to receive that care in VA hospitals. At present, most insurance contracts preclude payment to VA facilities, which is unfair; insurers should not be relieved of payments because their policyholders choose to be treated in VA hospitals. This will save the government \$40 million in fiscal year 1971.

Modern medical treatment makes possible permanent recovery from tuberculosis, and over a year ago the Congress ended future payments of \$67 per month to veterans whose disease is completely arrested. However, about 40,000 veterans, whose disease has been cured, are still on the compensation rolls; since their cure makes further compensation unnecessary, I propose that they be removed from the rolls at a saving of about \$46 million.

5. *Lower-priority agricultural programs.* The Federal government currently cost-shares with farmers certain conservation practices, a substantial part of which are in fact profitable farming techniques; as the number of large farms using these techniques has increased, there is less need for this program that now would require \$211 million in fiscal year 1971 appropriations. In addition, \$84 million per year is appropriated to subsidize the purchase of milk in schools for children, a great many of whose families are not poor; these resources should be reallocated to more effective nutritional programs to benefit children of poor families which will include milk as a part of the total program.

Federal crop insurance, a useful program, has developed to the point where Federal assistance can be gradually reduced. This insurance is now subsidized by the Federal government, and it should be made self-supporting over a period of time. I propose legislation adjusting premiums to cover administrative costs, which will produce a first full-year saving of \$12 million.

6. *The government-owned Alaska Railroad.* It is time for the Federal government to get out of the operation and ownership of the Alaska Railroad. With the discovery of oil and other potential economic development in Alaska, the need for Federal ownership has passed and the Alaska Railroad has become an attractive investment. It should be sold

either to the State of Alaska or to private enterprise for a substantial sum.

7. *Replacement of hospital grants with loan guarantees.* At one time, hospitals were not generating enough income to pay off capital construction loans; today, through reimbursements by Medicare, Medicaid and private insurance plans, the financial status of hospitals has been markedly improved. Accordingly, using the same principle that has been so successful in the Federal Housing Administration program, the 1971 budget terminates direct grants to hospitals in favor of a new program of mortgage guarantees to hospitals for construction capital with a liberal subsidization of the interest rates they will be charged. The new program, which will be more effective in stimulating hospital construction, will save the taxpayer \$65 million in fiscal year 1971.

8. *Miscellaneous items requiring Congressional action.* These include charging the industries involved to recover the costs of Federal grading, classing, and inspecting of tobacco, cotton and grain, saving \$4 million; charging to recover the costs of administering marketing agreements and orders, \$2 million; ending Federal formula grants to schools of veterinary medicine, a low priority item, \$3 million; turning over Federal maintenance of recreational marinas to the users of such facilities, \$1 million the first full year.

9. *Terminating the Coast Guard Selected Reserve Program.* The elimination of the Coast Guard Selected Reserve program would not significantly reduce the overall effectiveness of the Coast Guard. The proposed legislation eliminates the statutory requirement for a Selected Reserve within the Coast Guard Ready Reserve after fiscal year 1971.

It provides that personnel who are fulfilling their Selective Service obligation through the Coast Guard Reserve may be transferred, with their consent, to other Reserve components, with the assurance that their Coast Guard service will be credited toward fulfillment of that obligation. It is also anticipated that some personnel in the Selected Reserve would be retained in the Ready Reserve in a no-training status. All will be offered the opportunity of accepting a discharge from the Coast Guard Reserve or volunteering for extended active duty for the purpose of fulfilling their military service obligation. First full year savings are approximately \$25 million.

10. *Sale of stockpile commodities.* The greatest bulk of the stockpile materials to be disposed of in fiscal year 1971 would be sold in accordance with standing authorizations. With respect to those stockpile surpluses for which there is presently no disposal authority, we have already sent to the Congress twenty bills requesting the necessary authority. In addition, we have endorsed three other pending bills. The proposed sales program, including disposals which would be authorized under new legislation, would produce about \$750 million in fiscal 1971.

I am transmitting with this message a proposed Federal Economy Act of 1970.

Never has the need to curtail unnecessary spending been as vital as it is now. The rising cost of living, which causes so

much hardship to so many of our people, must be arrested; a balanced budget is needed to hold the line on rising prices and interest rates.

In this fight, no time-honored program is sacrosanct if it cannot be justified on the grounds of high priority; there is too much that needs to be done for all the people to permit special benefits to be conferred unfairly upon some of the people.

Of course animal-lovers want more veterinarians, but Federal funds should be spent on providing more doctors for people; of course harbors should be kept clear for pleasure craft, but Federal funds should be directed to help clean water for people to drink; of course all the elderly should be cared for, but Federal funds should be directed to medical rather than custodial care of the elderly who are poor and ill.

That is why we have looked at Federal spending with new eyes—not on the basis of government as it is, but on the basis of what comes first for now and tomorrow. The time is past for "more of the same."

Federal spending must be in response to present needs, not a reflex caused by old habits. The savings we make now are dollars enlisted in the fight against inflation, and there is no need more urgent to all the people than the need to hold down the rising cost of living.

I have already made a great many of the hard decisions that are mine to make to hold down nonessential domestic spending, above and beyond the substantial cuts already made in our defense budget, and I urge the Congress to make the hard, responsible decisions that the Congress is charged to make. This is no time for business as usual, spending as usual, politics as usual. This is the time for cutting out waste and cutting down costs with new vigor and new determination.

RICHARD NIXON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 26, 1970.

FEDERAL ECONOMY ACT OF 1970

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is time Congress was thinking about economy. For too long Congress has been too prone to think of possibilities and projects for the spending of the taxpayer's dollar.

The demands on the Treasury dollar are great, and much of the time those demands are not only legitimate but most pressing.

Today, however, President Nixon has presented us with an opportunity to save—to save in the interest of making what spending we do sanction the more meaningful and the more worthy.

The President has presented us with an opportunity and a challenge.

He has said to us, in effect: "The time has come for you and me to eliminate every dollar of unnecessary Federal spending and to prune away all of those spending items which are of low priority. Come, join with me in proving to the American people that it is possible for the Federal Government to function sensibly—that it is possible to cut out programs that have outworn their usefulness, programs that cannot be justified."

The President's message accompanying the Economy Act of 1970 should be carefully studied and pondered by every Member of the Congress. None should dismiss the President's proposals out of hand with the observation that these proposed cuts simply will not happen.

As the President has so aptly put it, this is no time for business as usual, no time for politics as usual.

This is a time for every Member of this House to become a statesman in the name of Government economy, a protector of the people's purse, a warrior in the fight against inflation, a stalwart in the fight for a balanced budget.

The recommendations in the President's economy message must be implemented.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 11702, MEDICAL LIBRARY ASSISTANCE EXTENSION ACT OF 1970

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11702) to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve and extend the provisions relating to assistance to medical libraries and related instrumentalities, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

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 statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of February 25, 1970.)

Mr. STAGGERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement of the managers be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, this conference report deals with the program of grants for assistance to medical libraries. The bill is long and complex, since it deals with a number of programs of assistance to medical libraries. As passed by the House the bill authorized a total of \$49½ million; as passed by the Senate the bill authorized a total of \$76½ million. The conferees split the difference between the two bills and the conference report provides for a total of \$62½ million for the programs of assistance to libraries.

In all other respects, the bill is essentially the same as the House version, except that a provision in the House bill permitting financial support for certain biomedical scientific projects was deleted, and the House conferees agreed to a Senate amendment permitting limited transfers of appropriated funds between categories.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good conference report, and we recommend its adoption by the House.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I am especially glad the

gentleman sees fit to yield and particularly that he addressed himself to the question of transferability of funds.

Do I correctly understand from the conference report that the transferability of funds also allows the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to call upon funds from future appropriations for a program of assistance for medical libraries and/or for use in another program of assistance?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes; but only after funds are appropriated, of course.

We have a limitation on the transfer of funds. It would have to be on any new authorizations from each year to year.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I think this is a very important legislative record we are making.

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALL. And it is important, I believe, that they cannot call upon future appropriations unless they have first been authorized—not only authorized but appropriated for in that year.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. So that we cannot make an advance call on funds that have neither been authorized nor appropriated. I ask the gentleman: Is that not correct?

Mr. STAGGERS. I assure the gentleman from Missouri that that is absolutely correct.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I am strongly in favor of the conference report and I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. May we be assured that the amendments, as a result of the conference the Senate, on this and the other conference reports that are to come before us today from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee are germane?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is our opinion, yes, sir. They are germane to the bills.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER).

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the creation and support of medical libraries has been recognized by this House as a vital link in the chain of health service delivery for some years now. The programs we have passed assist in construction, training of personnel, creation of and distribution of medical information in proper form for library use, and finally the founding of regional libraries. Although this is not one of the glamorous and thankfully not one of the expensive programs in the health field it is one of the foundation stones upon which the streamlining of health services and their ready availability to the American public must rest.

Differences even in proposed authorizations were not great in the House and Senate versions and these were compromised easily. As passed by the House the four programs would have been authorized at \$16.5 million per year for 3 years. The Senate version started at \$20.5 million for the first year and went up to \$30 million in the third year. The overall

totals of these two bills were split and spread through the 3-year period. This resulted in an addition of \$12 million altogether.

Other differences had to do with availability of funds and transferability. The House conferees held to making funds appropriated available for 1 extra year instead of indefinitely as proposed by the Senate version. Limited transferability of funds from one of the specific programs to another one was agreed to.

We recommend that the House adopt the conference report.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2809, PUBLIC HEALTH TRAINING

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2809) to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to extend for an additional period the authority to make formula grants to schools of public health, project grants for graduate training in public health and traineeships for professional public health personnel, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of February 25, 1970.)

Mr. STAGGERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the conference report before the House today provides for a 3-year extension of the existing program under which formula grants are made to schools of public health to reimburse them for a portion of the costs which they incur in training federally sponsored students at these schools.

The Senate proposed to extend this program for 5 years, at a higher level of funding, but in conference this extension was limited to 3 years, but at the level of funding recommended by the Senate. We felt this added money was necessary because of the development of a number of new schools of public health in recent years.

The Senate bill also provided for a 4-year extension of the existing program under which traineeships are provided for professional public health personnel, and the program of project grants to schools of public health for the costs of new programs, or improvement in existing programs at those schools.

The conference agreement limits the extension of these two programs to 2

years, at authorizations reduced below the level contained in the Senate bill.

As a result of this legislation, all programs of grants specifically oriented to schools of public health will terminate simultaneously hereafter, so that these programs can be considered together in the future.

The managers on the part of the House are unanimous in recommending that the House adopt this conference report.

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

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the conference report before us at this time concerns grant assistance to the few schools organized to prepare professionals for the field of public health which is becoming increasingly important as we expand the services offered to our citizens. It is not a new program, and the House version merely extended the formula grants which run to the schools to support general expenses. We had provided authorizations of \$7, \$9 and \$12 million for the next 3 fiscal years. As the bill came to conference it had an additional year added and somewhat larger funds for each year. We report back to you a conference version which limits the program to 3 years and splits the funding differences, resulting in authorizations of \$9, \$12 and \$18 million for the next 3 fiscal years.

There are two other programs which affect schools of public health and which will be expiring next year. They provide traineeships for public health training of people already committed to the health professions, and project grants to encourage and assist schools of public health to create new and better graduate courses in this field. The House did not include an extension of these programs at this time, but the other body did.

Since there is no quarrel with either program the conference accepted the inclusion of these additional programs in this bill limiting, however, both of them to 3 years and reducing somewhat the authorizations included in the version which passed the other body. As a result we are recommending authorizations for the traineeships at \$14, \$16, and \$18 million for the next 3 years, and \$14, \$15, and \$16 million for project grants. Since authorizations were already available for the last two programs for fiscal 1971, the extensions are for a total of 3 years but only two of these are new. This makes all three programs terminate simultaneously which should expedite and make their consideration more logical in the future.

I recommend that the House adopt the conference report.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 14733, HEALTH SERVICES FOR DOMESTIC AGRICULTURAL MIGRANTS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 14733) to amend the Public Health

Service Act to extend the program of assistance for health services for domestic migrant agricultural workers and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROONEY of New York). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of February 25, 1970.)

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the conference report presently before the House provides a 3-year extension of the existing program under which health services are provided for domestic agricultural migrant workers. Both the House and Senate versions of the legislation contain the same level of funding, so that the report is identical to the bill as it passed the House in this regard. The House bill also provided coverage under project grants for a limited number of seasonal agricultural workers, where providing health services to these persons would improve health conditions of migrants themselves. The conference agreement is identical to the House bill in this regard.

The Senate bill also contains an amendment providing for community participation in the development of programs. The House conferees accepted this Senate amendment, with the understanding that community participation in the development and implementation of these programs would be limited to the development of new, or modification of existing programs, but do not extend to the actual administration of the programs. It is our feeling that the modification should apply to new grants made hereafter, and to renewals of existing grants at the time they are considered for renewal.

The managers on the part of the House were unanimous in their agreement to the report, and we recommend the adoption by the House.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report.

Since this legislation was passed into law in 1962, hundreds of thousands of migrant workers in almost all parts of this Nation have received medical help. Each year of the program has seen additional migrant workers helped.

This year's extension of that legislation, however, is to date the broadest and most effective since its original passage.

For the first time we are enlarging the target area to those persons who work with and whose health conditions also affect the migrants in the fields. We estimate that there are approximately 1 million migrants, but there are at least a million additional seasonal workers and maybe as many as 2 million who do not leave their home base.

Yet these people who work side by side with the migrants have not had the bene-

fit of the program, but they should. The health problems of the farmworkers are not limited to traveling workers. Domestic and migrant workers are together in the fields, and we cannot continue to overlook the fact that disease and illness can spread without regard to classification of the worker.

This bill calls for appropriation of \$20 million in fiscal 1971, \$25 million in fiscal 1972, and \$30 million for fiscal 1973. This represents an encouraging increase over this year's \$15 million. But based on a million migrant population figure, it allows for an average of only \$20 per person for medical care compared to the national average of more than \$300 for each man, woman, and child in the non-migrant population. So it is evident that we can do still more in this area.

For my colleagues who are not completely familiar with the migrant health program, I would like to point out that migrant use of medical care is about one-seventh the national average. Their dental care is about one-twentieth, and their use of hospital care is about one-fourth that of the general population.

The mortality of migrants from TB, influenza, pneumonia, and other infectious diseases is more than twice the national average. These also exist and are similar in the seasonal agricultural workers and their families.

Although there are three main migrant streams, the area covered by these wandering workers is national in scope and indeed is a national problem.

So far, we have estimated that only one-third of the migrant population has been reached by the program. We must do better.

I am encouraged at the work being done in Florida. In the Palm Beach County area there is a peak migrant population of approximately 38,000. The county health officer there has reported that all 38,000 have received some benefits from the Migrant Health Act. In addition, more than 11,000 have received medical assistance, either through aid in clinics or hospitals.

To give an idea of the scope of the program on the national level, it is estimated that 120,000 received medical care last year; 21,000 received dental care and there were 210,000 medical visits and 28,000 dental visits.

In Broward County, approximately 3,000 have received direct medical treatment. Almost 1,000 have received dental treatment, 1,000 have been helped in nursing clinics and 1,400 have participated in the immunization program. During the past year, migrants have registered almost 3,900 visits to clinics and have been treated in hospitals for 1,161 days.

Mr. Speaker, presently there are 116 single or multicounty projects operating with Migrant Health Act assistance in 36 States and Puerto Rico. Yet, there are 900 of the Nation's 3,000 counties that are annually temporary homes to migrants ranging in number from 100 to 40,000.

These 116 projects reach 300 counties, but in the other 600 counties health care is sporadic and often crisis oriented. We have made progress. But we still must do more. We must reach those remaining two-thirds of the target areas.

I think that H.R. 14733 will help us in assuring that the migrant and seasonal farmworkers in this Nation are assured of decent health service. I urge passage of this legislation and commend those who have worked on this very important program.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to rise in support of this commendable legislation and would like to know if the gentleman from West Virginia will yield for a question?

Mr. STAGGERS. I would be happy to do so.

Mr. GONZALEZ. With respect to the certain types of migratory workers, what exactly does this mean?

Mr. STAGGERS. All migratory workers that come from outside the State or move in interstate commerce.

Mr. GONZALEZ. All migratory workers?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. GONZALEZ. In the statement accompanying this conference report you refer to the fact—and this can be found on page 3—that this is to be limited to projects which will improve the health conditions of migratory workers themselves?

Mr. STAGGERS. I might explain this—that certain workers in the United States who are employed in a group of migratory workers from outside, if there is a disease of any kind or epidemic of any kind or certain conditions that necessitate the migratory workers receive health care, then the others could receive help.

Mr. GONZALEZ. One further question: This is not intended to be limited to the permanent residence of the migratory workers?

Mr. STAGGERS. No, it is not.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman very much and I commend the gentleman for this very worthy legislation.

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

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress is to be congratulated for its action today in passing four bills that are keystones in our public health service. These bills bear the imprint of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and I am honored to have shared in working on these vital programs.

Perhaps we did not go quite far enough with this legislation, but at least we kept the programs alive and moving. Although I would have preferred a higher level of funding, these are not the times to cling doggedly to spending programs.

These four bills extend, and in some cases, improve our Federal programs in the areas of mental health, migrant worker health, public health training and medical library assistance.

S. 2523, the mental health bill, not only extends existing programs, but takes steps toward dealing with the mental problems that are magnified by the ex-

cessive use of alcohol and drug addiction. It is only humane that we increase our efforts to deal with these problems that are hidden within the fibers of our society—yet real and increasing in scope. I am especially proud that this bill increases the Federal participation in dealing with mental problems dealing with children. In this way, perhaps we can reclaim some young lives before they are lost forever. I had hoped we might increase the Federal participation in the grant ratio to at least a matching status. However, I much prefer this much of the cake to none at all.

Providing health services for migratory agricultural workers and their burgeoning families is both good and necessary action. H.R. 14733 will focus new light and bring new hope for the migrant workers. Also, we have extended and enlarged the coverage of the act that Congress initially passed 2 years ago. This program is vital to my district, especially. I am pleased to report that we have one of the finest migrant health centers in the Nation in San Marcos, Tex. This small band of dedicated workers is one of the more active groups in the United States.

In a time when the Nation is suffering from a shortage of trained technicians and professional people in the medical field, Congress accepted the responsibility of amending the Public Health Service Act to extend the authority making formula grants to schools of public health. Also, we added significantly to the trainee programs for professional public health personnel. Texas is blessed with many good medical schools and this bill, S. 2809, should only strengthen an already strong State program. Here again, we took a long overdue step when we amended the Public Health Service Act to improve and extend the provisions relating to assistance to medical libraries.

True, these bills are not perfect nor do they provide all the money that is needed. The significant thing, the meaningful thing is that these bills are at least a reassurance that Congress is taking notice of our Nation's health problems, physical and mental. We are aware of our neighbor's problems and we will not forget them.

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

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, some years ago the House recognized the plight of migrant agricultural workers in regard to health services. Seldom citizens of the places where they worked, they found no local health facilities open to them and no programs for any preventive medicine. This situation endangered both the migrants and the communities.

With the leadership and grant assistance provided by the program under consideration now the situation has been materially bettered. Literally hundreds of communities where migrants work have programs to provide health care and, since our last renewal of the law, emergency hospital services.

The bill we passed some time ago recognized another situation. The health of nonmigrant workers who labor along

side the migrant can cause some of the very problems we had hoped to avoid. So where the health of the nonmigrant is so closely connected we allowed the use of funds for both on the same basis.

The Senate version varied but little from the House version of this program. Community and citizen participation in the formulation of these vital programs is a good thing. Certainly they cannot be administered by a committee system, and all knowledgeable elements of the community should have an interest in them and a chance to contribute to their success. The Senate version contained language to effect this and the conferees accepted. Otherwise the bill was taken as passed by the House.

We recommend that the conference report be adopted by the House.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2523, COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS AMENDMENTS OF 1970

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2523) to amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to extend and improve the program of assistance under that act for community mental health centers and facilities for the treatment of alcoholics and narcotic addicts, to establish programs for mental health of children, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of February 25, 1970.)

Mr. STAGGERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the statement.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, the conference report we bring before the House today is on one of the most important health bills to be considered during this session of the Congress. Twenty-five years ago there were 462,000 resident patients in State and local government mental hospitals in the United States. By 1955 this number had grown to 559,000 patients, and if those trends had continued, we would today have over 800,000 patients in mental institutions. Instead, we have 306,000. This drastic drop is due to two reasons. The principal reason is the use of psychoactive drugs in the treatment of

mental illness, but an important part has also been played by the substantial increase in trained medical manpower in the field of mental health.

Notwithstanding this progress, it still is a melancholy fact of life that one American in each 10, at present rates of admission to mental institutions, will spend some portion of his life confined to a mental institution. We have to do something about this, and this bill is intended to do just that.

The existing program of grants for construction and staffing of community mental health centers was established in 1963. Under this program, matching grants are made to the States following the Hill-Burton formula for meeting a portion of the costs of construction of community mental health centers. In addition, grants are made to meet a declining portion of the costs of professional and technical personnel staffing these facilities with the Federal assistance limited to 4 years and 3 months.

Based on our experience to date with this program, the bill as passed by the House provided a 3-year extension of the authorizations for construction and staffing these centers, and provided an additional period of Federal assistance for staffing costs. In addition, the bill provided extra matching for the costs of construction and staffing of facilities in rural or urban poverty areas. We provided also special incentives for construction and staffing of facilities to treat narcotic addicts, and facilities for treatment of alcoholics. In addition, we added a new program of special incentives for facilities serving the mental health needs of children, and also adopted an amendment sponsored by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN) providing special incentives for consultation services.

The Senate amended their bill in general to increase the amounts of the authorizations. In general, the conference agreement splits the difference between the two Houses, except with respect to the program for alcoholics and narcotic addiction, where larger amounts were agreed to.

In addition, the Senate had provided a higher portion of Federal matching for operating costs of these facilities, and would have extended the period of Federal assistance to 10 years. We compromised with them and provided that Federal assistance would run for 8 years, and provided in general a liberalized definition of technical personnel, so as to cover some additional costs.

Mr. Speaker, the managers on the part of the House are unanimous in recommending that the House agree to this conference report.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to yield whatever time the gentleman might require.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, aside from the basic program for hospital construction which has been with us now for many years, the most important and progressive health program created by the Congress has been the community mental health centers construction and staffing legislation. It has struck at the

heart of the most difficult and most tragic health problems faced by all communities, large and small.

Originally created to get going on facilities for mental health care, it has been recognized that these same local institutions are the proper place to add the other equally vital services for drug addicts and alcoholics. Now we are making a new and maybe the most important addition—mental health service designated especially for children.

All of this was in our bill as it went to conference. It is a big, complicated and expensive program but one to which we are fully committed and one which is paying off.

I will not try to outline again the details of the program. For our purpose here I think it is sufficient to remind the Members that it provides for construction and initial staffing of community mental health centers including the services mentioned before. Our bill had also recognized the need for somewhat liberalized provisions in both grants and staffing for poverty areas.

The differences to be ironed out were not concerned with the philosophy of the legislation. On that there was agreement between the Houses. The differences were concerned rather with level of effort, and they were significant. This body had tried very hard to be realistic in its authorizations and all other provisions. Probably because it is an area where the need is so apparent and progress too urgent, the Senate version provided greater authorizations in every category and expanded staffing support much more than the House version.

Because of these differences, greater compromises were necessary. Authorizations had not been made casually in either instance, and, therefore, conferees for both Houses found it difficult to recede and accept those offered by the other. Without trying to outline each figure, I wish to report that we did hammer out compromises which generally fell about halfway between the original figures. I do not think either set of conferees is entirely happy with this, but I am satisfied that if this program is to proceed, it is the necessary action, and we can take some comfort in knowing that appropriations justifications must still be made in each of the areas.

Staffing support has been provided for 4 years and 3 months up to this time. The House bill extended this to 6 years and 3 months, while the Senate version extended it to 10 years. Agreement was reached on an 8-year program. Actually we will be looking at the entire program again long before this period has run, and we can, therefore, evaluate the propriety of the longer staffing support after it has been in force for a few years.

The bill allows the use of staffing funds for new categories of personnel. Originally we limited it to doctors and similar professionals and some technicians. Such people are in short supply, and assistance with staffing costs for them is justified.

It is my opinion that the compromises made and the agreements reached by the conference are fair and supportable. The integrity of the programs as passed by the House have been held intact, and

the authorizations finally agreed to, while larger than the committee and the House originally contemplated, are not unduly enlarged by the conference report. We urge its adoption.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I will be happy to yield whatever time the gentleman might require.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report of S. 2523, the Community Mental Health Centers Amendments of 1970.

This legislation would extend for 3 fiscal years, through fiscal 1973, the program of grants for construction of Community Mental Health Centers. A total of \$270 million is authorized for this very worthwhile program which has been extremely successful.

The programs of grants for the initial operation of these community mental health centers and the staffing grants, have likewise been extended for 3 fiscal years, through 1973, and a total of \$155 million has been authorized for this period. The duration of these grants has been extended from the present 4 years and 3 months to 8 years.

With regard to the grant programs for facilities and services for alcoholics and narcotic addicts, the conference report authorizes a total of \$105 million for the three fiscal years, ending July 1, 1973. We intend that real emphasis be given to the treatment of alcoholics and narcotic addicts.

Insofar as services are concerned, the duration of the staffing grants have been extended from the present 4 years, 3 months to 8 years.

The House and Senate versions of this legislation both included a new provision to establish a program for the mental health of children, and provides for grants for the construction of facilities for the mental health of children, the cost of professional and technical personnel in new facilities for the mental health of children or in new services in existing facilities, and for training and program evaluation. The conference report authorizes a total of \$62 million for the 3 fiscal years, ending July 1, 1973.

Staffing grants made under this new section would be for a duration of 8 years.

Mr. Speaker, as author of the House bill I am encouraged that this legislation can soon be sent to the President for the extension of these most important programs. Since 1963, when these programs were first begun, the number of resident patients in State and local government mental hospitals in the United States has dropped from 504,000 to about 350,000, a decrease of about one-third, and we should keep in mind that this program really did not begin to function until 1966 and 1967.

As a conferee on this measure, I believe passage of this legislation will enable us to more fully carry forward our efforts to treat the mentally ill, the alcoholic, the narcotic addict, and particularly the children who are stricken with mental illness.

Moreover, it should be noted that every community mental health center, even if it does not have specific grants for alcoholism or narcotic addiction, can

provide assistance to persons suffering from any mental or emotional disability, particularly adolescent narcotic addicts or drug abusers.

When the Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare held hearings last year on this legislation, testimony was received urging that the present staffing grants be expanded to cover the cost of all operations of the community mental health centers.

The committee did not feel that we should, at this time, adopt such a broad approach to the staffing of these centers, principally because to do so would offer less encouragement to the States and local areas to support these facilities.

However, the committee did recognize the need for an expansion of the definition of staffing personnel in order to assist the centers in becoming effective quickly.

To that end the conference report represents, I believe, a realistic approach to the problem of staffing assistance. The term "technical personnel" is defined to include: "accountants, financial counselors, allied health professional personnel, dietary and culinary personnel, and any other personnel whose background and education would indicate that they are to perform technical functions in the operation of the centers or facilities for which assistance is provided." It would not include minor clerical personnel and maintenance or housekeeping personnel.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this conference report which I believe represents a very realistic and encouraging extension of our present efforts to combat mental illness at the local level.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my comments relative to this very worthwhile bill, which reminds us of the things that have been accomplished in this field, nationwide, and which have been most rewarding to those of us who have given attention to the problem of mental health.

In my own State, mental health centers were set up years ago and we are proud of the results. In our State-owned hospitals which certainly were very necessary, we find that the population has dwindled.

Congressman Brock came to my office with a witness from his State pointing out the needed personnel in our community health centers, and the scarcity of that personnel. Therefore, we should spread out and fully utilize the expertise available to assist other community institutions such as the schools.

In this bill there are funds which will permit this. Mental health center personnel can go out for others and help them in this process of formulating and carrying out mental health programs.

Mr. Speaker, I think this amendment is a good addition to the bill, and I hope it produces great results.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to join those who are complimenting the committee on bringing this conference report to the floor, and especially on the attainments that have been made, basically, by this legislation in cutting down mental health facility occupancy, and otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, I have one question about the conference report. I think it is just a technical question. Do I understand that the conference report strikes down the provision of the House bill that would have required a State health department or its mental health authority or a State comprehensive health planning agency approval before grants or other help could be tendered—to the end result that on recommendation of some national advisory council, grants may be made directly to any not-for-profit corporation in the municipalities or areas?

Mr. STAGGERS. I might reply to the gentleman in response in this way.

The House bill did carry provisions that local and other comprehensive planning groups must take a look at this program before it is approved. But that made it go through three groups.

The original bill, the Senate bill, said that the application must go through the State mental health department for approval as being consistent with the State mental health plan there before they can get a center.

It was argued that this required unnecessary redtape. That is the only thing we deleted along this line, and it still goes through the State mental health department. This goes directly from your locality to your State and then to the Federal Government.

Mr. HALL. In other words, in coming up through channels for Federal grant approval, it comes through the echelon or layers of the State health department or mental health council; is that correct?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes—one—just one—that is all. So we eliminated review by two others.

So the application only goes through the mental health department of the State.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman's distinguished committee has previously "suffered," and I use that word advisedly, under legislation passed by this body wherein an outside agency was granted authority to determine whether a grant for schools of nursing, for example, might be authorized and appropriated or not regardless of State authorities' approval.

We are not getting ourselves in the same position in the case of this conference report; are we? This is what I want to know.

Mr. STAGGERS. In answer to the gentleman from Missouri, I can say emphatically "No." I know what the gentleman is talking about. He is talking about the accreditation of nursing schools. No, this has nothing to do with that whatsoever.

Mr. HALL. I am aware it has naught to do with nursing schools and I was simply citing an example of administrative error. From time to time in other committees of Congress we have been placed

in the position where the approval of an outside agency of Government, other than Cabinet, was required for certain grants. I am thinking of urban mass transit, for example. I want to be sure that in this ongoing program, for which the gentleman is to be so highly commended, we are not getting locked into that kind of thing. The gentleman's assurance is very reassuring. I appreciate his statement.

Mr. STAGGERS. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and thank him very much.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to pay tribute to those Members who have worked so hard on a bill which means so much to America, the impact of which will be felt for many, many years to come. They have made a great start in providing for treatment of these diseases and ills that have been afflicting this country for so long, such as alcoholism. We have been throwing those so afflicted into jails. We have not been giving them proper treatment. We have been trying to hide people afflicted with mental disease, and now we are bringing those things out into the open. The mind as well as the body can be sick. For many years we have been treating the body, and now we have come to the point where we have decided to treat the ills of the mind and do away with those diseases.

I feel that this committee and the subcommittee, reporting to the full committee, have taken one of the great forward steps in knocking down one of the great ills that have afflicted this country. If we are successful in wiping out mental disorders and abnormalities, we will find that, in one fell blow, we have struck down most of the evils that afflict America today, such as crimes in the street, many diseases and abnormalities, lack of competence.

Specifically I wish to congratulate every member of the committee. I am sorry that the chairman of the subcommittee, JOHN JARMAN, is not present. He is in the hospital. Next to him was PAUL ROGERS of Florida, who is here today; DAVID SATTERFIELD, PETER KYROS, and RICHARDSON PREYER; and on the minority side, the ranking member, WILLIAM SPRINGER, ANCHER NELSEN, TIM LEE CARTER, JOE SKUBITZ of Kansas, and JAMES HASTINGS of New York.

These gentlemen have done what I consider to be a yeoman's job. The measures that subcommittee has handled, and will be handling during this Congress are among the most important measures for America that this body will consider.

One further thing I believe is noteworthy—every bill that subcommittee has recommended to our full committee has been recommended unanimously by the subcommittee. That shows how well these men work together, and I believe they do an excellent job.

I also believe that if there is anything that this Congress ought to be remembered for it is the health legislation that is coming out of that subcommittee, which is being approved by the full committee, and which the House is passing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. 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 369, nays 0, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—369

Abbott	de la Garza	Hollifield
Abernethy	Delaney	Horton
Adair	Dellenback	Hosmer
Adams	Denney	Howard
Addabbo	Dent	Hull
Albert	Derwinski	Hungate
Anderson,	Devine	Hunt
Calif.	Diggs	Hutchinson
Anderson, Ill.	Dingell	Ichord
Andrews, Ala.	Donohue	Jacobs
Andrews,	Dorn	Jarman
N. Dak.	Dowdy	Johnson, Calif.
Annuizio	Downing	Johnson, Pa.
Arends	Dulski	Jonas
Ashbrook	Duncan	Jones, Ala.
Ashley	Dwyer	Jones, Tenn.
Aspinall	Eckhardt	Karath
Ayres	Edmondson	Kastenmeier
Barrett	Edwards, Ala.	Kazen
Beall, Md.	Edwards, Calif.	Keith
Belcher	Ellberg	King
Bell, Calif.	Erlenborn	Kleppe
Bennett	Eshleman	Kluczynski
Betts	Evans, Colo.	Koch
Bevill	Evins, Tenn.	Kuykendall
Blaggi	Fallon	Kyl
Blester	Farbstein	Kyros
Bingham	Fascell	Landrum
Blackburn	Feighan	Latta
Blanton	Findley	Lloyd
Blatnik	Fish	Long, La.
Boggs	Fisher	Long, Md.
Boland	Flood	Lowenstein
Bolling	Flowers	Lujan
Bow	Flynt	Lukens
Brademas	Foley	McCarthy
Brasco	Ford, Gerald R.	McClary
Bray	Ford,	McCloskey
Brinkley	William D.	McCulloch
Broomfield	Foreman	McDade
Brown, Mich.	Fountain	McDonald,
Brown, Ohio	Fraser	Mich.
Broyhill, N.C.	Frelinghuysen	McFall
Buchanan	Frey	McKee
Burke, Fla.	Friedel	McMillan
Burke, Mass.	Fulton, Pa.	Macdonald,
Burleson, Tex.	Fulton, Tenn.	Mass.
Burlison, Mo.	Fuqua	MacGregor
Burton, Calif.	Gallifanakis	Madden
Burton, Utah	Gallagher	Mahon
Bush	Garmatz	Malillard
Button	Gaydos	Mann
Byrne, Pa.	Gettys	Marsh
Byrnes, Wis.	Gialmo	Martin
Cabell	Gibbons	Mathias
Caffery	Gilbert	Matsunaga
Carter	Goldwater	May
Casey	Gonzalez	Mayne
Cederberg	Goodling	Meeds
Celler	Gray	Melcher
Chamberlain	Griffin	Meskill
Chappell	Gross	Michel
Clancy	Grover	Miller, Calif.
Clark	Gubser	Miller, Ohio
Clausen,	Haley	Mills
Don H.	Hall	Minish
Clawson, Del.	Halpern	Mink
Clay	Hamilton	Mize
Cleveland	Hammer-	Mizell
Cohelan	schmidt	Mollohan
Collier	Hanley	Monagan
Colmer	Hanna	Montgomery
Conable	Hansen, Idaho	Moorhead
Conte	Hansen, Wash.	Morgan
Conyers	Harrington	Morse
Corbett	Harsha	Mosher
Corman	Harvey	Murphy, Ill.
Coughlin	Hastings	Murphy, N.Y.
Cowger	Hathaway	Myers
Cramer	Hawkins	Natcher
Crane	Hébert	Nedzi
Culver	Hechler, W. Va.	Nelsen
Cunningham	Heckler, Mass.	Nichols
Daddario	Helstoski	Nix
Daniel, Va.	Henderson	Obey
Daniels, N.J.	Hicks	O'Hara
Davis, Wis.	Hogan	O'Konski

Olsen	Rooney, N.Y.	Taylor
O'Neal, Ga.	Rooney, Pa.	Thompson, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.	Rostenkowski	Thomson, Wis.
Passman	Roth	Udall
Patman	Roudebush	Ullman
Patten	Roybal	Utt
Pelly	Ruppe	Van Deerlin
Perkins	Ruth	Vander Jagt
Philbin	Ryan	Vanik
Pickle	Sandman	Vigorito
Pike	Satterfield	Waggonner
Pirnie	Saylor	Waldie
Poage	Schadeberg	Wampler
Podell	Scheuer	Watkins
Poff	Schneebeli	Watts
Pollock	Schwengel	Weicker
Preyer, N.C.	Scott	Whalen
Price, Ill.	Sebelius	Whalley
Price, Tex.	Shipley	White
Pryor, Ark.	Shriver	Whitten
Pucinski	Sikes	Widnall
Purcell	Sisk	Wiggins
Quillen	Skubitz	Williams
Railsback	Slack	Wilson, Bob
Randall	Smith, Iowa	Wilson,
Rees	Smith, N.Y.	Charles H.
Reid, Ill.	Snyder	Winn
Reid, N.Y.	Springer	Wold
Reifel	Staggers	Wolff
Reuss	Stanton	Wright
Rhodes	Steed	Wyatt
Rivers	Steiger, Ariz.	Wydler
Roberts	Steiger, Wis.	Wyllie
Robison	Stephens	Wyman
Rodino	Stubblefield	Yates
Roe	Stuckey	Yatron
Rogers, Colo.	Sullivan	Zablocki
Rogers, Fla.	Talcott	Zion

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—62

Alexander	Green, Pa.	Powell
Anderson,	Griffiths	Rarick
Tenn.	Gude	Riegle
Baring	Hagan	Rosenthal
Berry	Hays	St Germain
Brock	Jones, N.C.	St. Onge
Brooks	Kee	Scherle
Brotzman	Kirwan	Smith, Calif.
Brown, Calif.	Landgrebe	Stafford
Broyhill, Va.	Langen	Stratton
Camp	Leggett	Symington
Carey	Lennon	Taft
Chisholm	McClure	Teague, Calif.
Collins	McEwen	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	Mikva	Thompson, N.J.
Dawson	Minshall	Tiernan
Dennis	Morton	Tunney
Dickinson	Moss	Watson
Edwards, La.	Ottinger	Whitehurst
Esch	Pepper	Young
Green, Oreg.	Pettis	Zwach

So the conference report was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hays with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Stafford.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Carey with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Mikva with Mr. Zwach.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Collins.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Dennis.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Watson.
Mr. McKee with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Whitehurst.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Langen.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Rarick.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Leggett.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Young.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Symington with Mr. Powell.
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. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the four conference reports just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 12025, NATIONAL FOREST TIMBER SUPPLY ACT OF 1969

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 799 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 799

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. 12025) to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial forest land, to establish a high timber yield fund, 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 Agriculture, 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 Agriculture now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, and all points of order against sections 4 and 5 of said amendment in the nature of a substitute are hereby waived. 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 recommend with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROONEY of New York). The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN), pending which I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 799 provides an open rule with two hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 12025, the National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act of 1969. The resolution also makes it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. Points of order are waived against

section 4 of the substitute because it includes a revolving fund and against section 5 which provides for transfer of funds.

The purpose of H.R. 12025 is to help meet increasing national demands for lumber and other wood products, including that needed for home construction, by substantially increasing the timber yield from the commercial forest land of the national forests. Intensified development and management of national forest commercial timberlands will enable these lands to produce a substantially increased yield. The bill is intended to provide a reliable and adequate source of funds to accomplish increased annual harvest from the national forests under sound conservation principles in such a way that short-range accomplishments will assure that long-range goals are realized.

A high timber yield fund in the U.S. Treasury would be established. All unallocated receipts from sale of timber and other forest products from the national forests would be credited to the fund. The bill would not affect the provisions for payment to States for the benefit of counties of 25 percent of national forest receipts under the acts of 1908 and 1911, or deposits required to cover costs of brush disposal under the Act of 1916.

The bill ties the use of moneys from the high timber yield fund to the regular appropriations process; allows moneys appropriated to be available until expended; and provides that if funds credited to the fund are not appropriated by Congress, within 2 fiscal years following the fiscal year in which they are credited, they shall be transferred to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

Moneys appropriated from the fund are to be allocated as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture or by the appropriation act making them available. Such moneys are specifically required to be used in conformity with the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act. Moneys could be used only for increasing timber yield through a number of specified management practices, which are set out in section 6 of the bill.

The Secretary of Agriculture is directed to establish programs to carry out the act, but subject to the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act.

The Secretary would be directed to submit to Congress within 1 year from date of enactment a program for development and management of all national forest resources.

Also, within 1 year from the date of enactment, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a program for the development of all the Nation's commercial forest lands for high sustained timber yield, including reference to farm and other small woodlands.

The Secretary would be required to report annually on the operation and effectiveness of the act. This would include a report yearly on the annual harvest; potential yield; actually accomplished and projected timber stand improvement, including costs; and projected harvest for the ensuing year.

The Secretary would be directed to establish policies for the sale of national forest timber that will, to the extent

possible, assure that small business concerns obtain a fair proportion of the total timber sold in each year from each national forest.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that this bill has assumed considerable proportions of controversy, and in large measure it seems to me that the controversy which has come about has been caused by a misunderstanding of what the bill actually contains as it is brought before the House today. The original bill, as proposed, was highly controversial because of a number of provisions. The facts are that the bill has been completely rewritten and there have been a substantial number of amendments adopted and, in fact, a substitute is before the Members today which is much different from the original legislation proposed.

In order to try to set the record straight very briefly, many people from the conservation groups across the country had grave reservations about the original language. I had a great deal of mail from my own district, where I have a very large population of Sierra Club members. Most of the Members of the House know the Sierra Club is concerned with matters of conservation. After having discussed this matter with them and after the committee had completed its work and submitted the substitute which is before us today, I submitted that to a number of members of the Sierra Club and others in my district, and after having discussed it with them and reviewed the bill as now written, some have withdrawn their opposition.

I must say that not all have withdrawn their opposition and I want to make that clear, because I am sure many Members may still be receiving mail on the issue; but in large measure, if I may say, I firmly believe there has been a great deal of misinformation developed, and as a result much of the opposition today has hinged on the interpretation of what the original legislation contained.

I see my friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), and my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, here, and I recognize they will be opposing the bill even as it is now written. I recognize their concern and I understand there still can be differences, but I believe even they will agree with me—I would hope—that the bill as now written and as it is now before the Members is certainly far preferable to the original piece of legislation that was introduced.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 799 in order that H.R. 12025 may be considered.

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

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the current bill does not do many things. It offers the possibility of mismanagement. I suspect it will not help the sponsors, and I doubt if the sponsors know very much about what is in the bill, but I would like to point out to my good friend, the gentleman from California, for whom I have a high regard, that when he points out there have been changing views on the part of the Sierra Club, I am here to say that every single national conservation organization, including the National Rifle Association—of which I

happen to be a director—is still opposed to this bill as of this moment.

Mr. SISK. But I am sure my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, would concede that much of the original information was totally misleading, but there have been many changes in this bill. I think in fairness to all Members of the Congress, and as far as I am concerned, I am in support of this legislation, I recognize it is controversial, but I would say those of us who have made some study, I think, are generally familiar with what is in the bill.

I think generally the timber interests know what is in the bill. Certainly it does not go nearly as far as they would have preferred to have it go. I make no bones about that. That is the reason why we have brought to you a bill today which I believe really has removed most of the real argument against the legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I should like to say I am sure the gentleman represents a most enlightened constituency, or else he probably would not be here, because he is a most valuable Member of this body.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate that statement.

Mr. DINGELL. And the gentleman, reflecting the viewpoint of that enlightened constituency, should certainly give credit to the opposition to the bill and listen to the opposition to the bill in his district, and vote against it.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the comments of my good friend.

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

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to my good friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I want to say to my good friend from California that I know of no conservation organization and I know of nobody who knows what is in this bill who is for it, outside of a few people who have a special interest or who will gain a special benefit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to my good friend—and as he well knows, he is my friend, as I have said before—I respect his opinion. But, let me set the record straight. I think I know what is in this bill and I am positive that the members of the Agriculture Committee supporting this legislation know what is in the bill and I can assure the gentleman that I have no special interest, monetary or otherwise, in connection with the timber industry and, further, I am sure this is true of many Members of this House who will be supporting this legislation.

I have not intimidated and I do not make the statement that any conservation organization per se has changed its mind. I have talked to individual members of the Sierra Club, and those are the only ones to whom I refer, who have changed their minds after reading the bill. I am not saying they reflect a majority.

I simply say that the bill as it is presently written has removed a great deal of the opposition I had originally experienced in my own area. This may

not be true of the gentleman's area; I do not know.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. I wish to say that the changes which have been made in the bill remind me very, very much of an old story told up in Pennsylvania, about a man who was arrested by the public health authorities when he was selling rabbit sausage. He said, when he was taken before the justice of the peace, that he admitted it was not all rabbit, that it was about a 50-50 deal, he had one horse and one rabbit.

That is about the same deal we have in this bill; there is about one rabbit for the people and a horse end of it for the timber industry.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the story of my good friend, and I appreciate his comments. I know he will agree I have a perfect right to disagree with that, because I believe the bill actually is a good bill.

I do not take a back seat to any man as a conservationist. I believe I am just as good a conservationist as the gentleman from Pennsylvania. We may disagree a little bit on methods to be used to improve conservation.

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

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 12025.

The new title of this bill is a misnomer. It was originally introduced as the National Timber Supply Act, which more accurately describes it than the present title, the National Forest Conservation and Management Act.

"What's in a name?" Shakespeare asked. "A rose by any other name would smell as sweet."

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, whatever you call it, this bill smells bad.

I cannot avoid the conclusion that this measure, masquerading as a housing bill and a conservation bill, actually should be labeled as a bill for the relief of the lumber cutting industry. Ninety percent of our national forests would be vulnerable to greatly intensified lumber cutting under this bill. We should be concerned about what this would do to the natural values we want to preserve. I have great respect for the integrity and wisdom of my many friends in both parties on our great Committee on Agriculture. I must take issue, however, with the committee's statements on the need for this legislation.

According to the committee report—

The basic purpose of this bill is to help meet increasing national demands for lumber and other wood products, including that needed for home construction, by substantially increasing the timber yield from the commercial forest land of the national forests.

If that is the case, why have we not heard from the housing authorities downtown on the need for this legislation? I know that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, George Romney, is a dedicated man. I know that he is striving with all his might to overcome this country's housing deficiencies—and they are serious. I cannot imagine Secretary Romney remaining

silent on this bill if it really would help ease the housing crisis. I am sure he would—long before this—have spoken up in favor of it if lumber supplies in this country really are so short, or threaten to be so short, as to threaten our capacity to meet the housing goals of the Nixon administration, and if this legislation were needed to solve such a problem. But there is not one word in this report from Secretary Romney or any other housing authority on the need of the bill.

We may need increased lumber production to meet future requirements. I have no doubt that we do. In working out a policy to achieve the level of production needed, however, we should make sure that we adhere fully, in spirit as well as letter, to the basic principle of the Multiple Use Act of 1960. That principle is that all of the five uses of our national forests—water, wildlife, wood, forage, and recreation—are equally important and equal in priority for funding.

This bill would unbalance the multiple-use principle in favor of a single function—the commercial production of lumber. With all the unallocated receipts earmarked for increasing the timber yield, as called for under this bill, the delicate balance achieved under the Multiple Use Act could be restored only by more appropriations for the other four functions.

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

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding and the statement he made about the waivers of points of order on the committee substitute printed in the bill as an amendment. I wonder if we could develop that a little further.

As I understand it, section 4 of the committee amendment to the bill—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time yielded by the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

I shall be glad to comment on that section. The reading of section 4, of course, where it sets up a revolving fund, shows what is involved. According to the Parliamentarian, it would be subject to a point of order except for such a waiver as is provided.

Of course, section 5 does provide for transfer of funds in connection with the carrying out of this act.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not true that under the high timber yield fund under section 4 there are certain restrictions for which it can be used and otherwise it reverts to the Treasury out of that fund and, finally, under section 5 they all revert if not used within 2 fiscal years for these specific purposes?

Mr. SISK. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALL. In the opinion of the gentleman from the Committee on Rules, could a separate vote be demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment as printed in the bill?

Mr. SISK. Yes. It is my understanding that the rule so provides.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman. This could be a subject of parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SISK. Yes. I was going to say so. It is my understanding that it definitely would, I would say to my good friend from Missouri.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 799 provides for 2 hours of general debate on H.R. 12025, a bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial forest land, to establish a high timber yield fund, and for other purposes.

All points of order against sections 4 and 5 are waived because section 4 creates a revolving fund, and section 5 has language of appropriations included.

The genesis of this legislation began approximately 1 year ago when I introduced a resolution calling for an investigation by the House Banking and Currency Committee of the high prices of lumber and plywood. Prices had risen on both lumber and plywood to an astronomical point climaxed by a 90-day upsurge which almost doubled the prices of these two items.

As the author of this resolution, I was the leadoff witness before the House Banking and Currency Committee at these hearings, and my testimony called attention to some of the factors which I thought had brought about the increase in prices of lumber and plywood; offered short-range solutions, some of which were adopted, and then made recommendations for long-range proposals to alleviate this situation. One of these was an increase in timber sales from the national forests, based on good conservation practices.

Private owners of timber are doing a far better job of maintaining a sustained yield by adopting modern methods of forestry to replace cutover areas. The land is cultivated, seedlings are planted, fertilizer is used, and thinning is carried out. The normal procedure which has been in effect for many years in cutting over an area is to leave a few trees here and there for reseeding purposes. These trees will, by the process of nature, reseed the area which has been logged. Private efforts in the field of sustained yield, however, are much more efficient and can produce a new crop of trees in a much shorter period of time. I am told by experts in this field that the growth rate can be almost doubled by the planting of seedlings, cultivating the land, and applying fertilizer.

The logical question then, Mr. Speaker, is why the U.S. Forest Service does not follow these methods. The answer is that they have not been supplied sufficient funds to do the job. The legislation which we have before us today provides that the funds from the sale of Government-owned timber would go into a fund to be used for reforestation.

I want to call your attention to the fact, however, that these funds, under the bill, must be appropriated by the Congress, and if not appropriated within 2 years, would revert to the General Treasury of the United States.

I want to emphasize, also, that the bill specifically provides in three different sections that the Multiple Use-Sus-

tained Yield Act of 1960 is to remain in force. It is not amended in any manner.

This legislation epitomizes good conservation practices notwithstanding the criticism of the Sierra Club. Contrary to statements which have been made, this bill does not in any way amend the Organic Administration Act of 1897, the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960, the Wilderness Act of 1964, or the National Scenic Trail and Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968.

The Agriculture Committee reported, "indeed, the bill is intended to sustain all of these laws while strengthening the Organic Administration Act of 1897 which established the National Forests."

Again, contrary to some erroneous information which has been put out, this legislation would not allow timber in National Parks or wilderness areas to be logged.

Under the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act, the national forests must be managed not only for the sustained production of timber, but also for outdoor recreation, protection of stream flow, livestock grazing, maintenance of fish and wildlife resources, and production of minerals. These basic conservation requirements preclude rapid liquidation of old-growth timber in disregard of other national forest purposes which include the maintenance of future timber harvests.

The Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act states, and I quote:

The purposes of this Act are declared to be supplemental to, but not in derogation of, the purposes for which the National Forests were established as set forth in the Organic Administration Act of June 4, 1897.

Now, let us take a look at some wording in the 1897 act. It states:

No forest shall be established except to improve and protect the forest within the boundaries, or for the purposes of securing favorable water conditions, and to furnish a continuous supply of timber for the use and necessities of the citizens of the United States.

We need additional lumber production to fill the urgently needed housing goals in this country. The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 sets a goal of 26 million homes to be built in 10 years. This is 2.6 million homes per year, or double the rate actually achieved in 1969. Housing permits for January 1970 were at a rate of less than 1 million units per year. If we are to meet these goals, the growth rate of trees and the consequent replacement of trees must be increased. This legislation is the vehicle whereby this can be accomplished.

In order to meet the goals of the seventies to provide adequate housing for American citizens, lumber production will have to be greatly increased. Secretary Romney, testifying last year before the House Banking and Currency Committee stated that housing demands will require a doubling of the amount of softwood lumber available for housing by 1978.

The national forests are not furnishing their fair share of lumber in relationship to the number of their acres of forests. The Forest Service administers 186 million acres in the national forests. Of this, 97 million acres are classified as

commercial forest land. A recent Forest Service inventory reveals that 53 percent of the softwood saw timber in the country is in national forest lands, but yet, the yield from the national forests since 1957 was only 30 percent of the Nation's softwood saw timber.

Now, this gets, Mr. Speaker, to the nub of this entire piece of legislation. The sustained-yield methods that are practiced by private industries such as Weyerhaeuser, International Paper, St. Regis Paper, U.S. Plywood, and many, many others who own millions of acres of timberland in the Northwest and in other portions of the country, have resorted to the sustained-yield method in order to make these trees grow faster and to replace that which is cut. This cuts back on the length of time required, for instance, to produce a Douglas fir tree to marketable size from 100 years of growth by natural methods by about 40 percent.

In other words, have it ready for the market in about 60 years' time by utilizing the sustained yield. That is all we are doing in this legislation. We are going to properly cultivate and utilize our forest lands to make sure that we can replenish the cutover timber and supply future needs for lumber in this country and that is what the entire bill is about.

Let us take a look now at the need for this legislation.

Trees become ripe the same as does fruit. At the present rate of sale of timber from the national forests, we are not even harvesting all of the trees that have reached this stage. After a tree reaches the stage of ripeness, its value for commercial production decreases rapidly and materially.

One argument against this bill which will be made today will state that lumber production has not increased in the last 40 or 50 years. Therefore, there is no need for this legislation.

Total consumption of lumber in 1905 in the United States was 42.5 billion feet. In 1968, it was 43 billion feet—about the same. This was lumber production. In addition, however, and due to changing practices in construction, plywood has now come into the picture, and plywood production jumped from 2½ billion feet in 1950, to 14½ billion feet in 1968—and this is over and above lumber production.

It will be charged, also, that we are exporting logs and lumber from the United States. A great deal of erroneous figures have been put out in this respect, and therefore there will not be any shortage in this country. In 1968, we exported slightly under 2.5 billion feet of softwood logs, most of which went to Japan. In 1969, this figure dropped approximately 100 million feet.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that the Foreign Aid Act of 1968 limited the amount of logs which could be exported from Federal lands and Federal forests to 350 million feet per year. This had some effect in reducing exports last year, and will undoubtedly have a further effect in 1970.

This restriction on exports, however, will expire at the close of calendar year 1971, and should be renewed.

Exports of softwood lumber in 1969 totaled approximately 1 billion feet, but imports of softwood lumber during

the same year totaled 5.8 billion feet, most of which came from Canada.

The Department of Agriculture is in complete support of this bill, and there are no objections from the Bureau of the Budget, as indicated in the letter of February 11 to Chairman POAGE of the House Agriculture Committee from Secretary of Agriculture Clifford Hardin. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to include this letter in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 11, 1970.

Hon. W. R. POAGE,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We have carefully reviewed H.R. 12025, a bill "To provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial forest land, to establish a high timber yield fund, and for other purposes," as favorably reported by your Committee with amendment.

H.R. 12025 was itself a revision of an earlier bill for similar purposes. The changes that it made with the changes made in the bill as reported out by your Committee include the substance of all of the recommendations made by this Department. Among improvements in the bill are specific references to the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of June 12, 1960, to assure the continued application of the principles of multiple use and sustained yield in the development and administration of the National Forests.

We are strongly of the opinion that this legislation will promote greatly improved forest management practices and is essential to improving the timber producing capacity of the National Forests within multiple use and sustained yield principles.

H.R. 12025 as reported has the complete approval of this Department and we recommend that it be enacted.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD M. HARDIN,
Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. MARTIN. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from remarks made by the first great conservationist in this country, Theodore Roosevelt, in speaking of the historical objectives of our national forests, and I quote:

First and foremost, you can never afford to forget for one moment what is the object of our forest policy. That object is not to preserve the forests because they are refuges for the wild creatures of the world, though that is important. But, the primary object of our forest policies as the land policy of the United States is the making of prosperous homes. It is part of the traditional policy of homemaking of our country. Every other consideration comes as secondary. The whole effort of the government in dealing with the forests must be directed to this end, keeping in view the fact that it is not only necessary to start the homes as prosperous, but to keep them so. That is why the forests have got to be kept. You can start a prosperous home by destroying the forest, but you cannot keep it prosperous that way.

Sixty-seven years later, just last October, Dr. Melville Bell Grosvenor, a dedicated conservationist and chairman of

the board of the National Geographic Society, reemphasized President Roosevelt's thesis that wise use is a basic element of true conservation. He told the American Forestry Association:

Important as it is, pure preservation is but a minor aspect of good conservation. *The big thing in conservation is wise use of the things we possess.* Merely to survive, we must use our natural resources. We must eat, we must clothe and house ourselves. If in so doing we ruin our soil, pollute our waters, defile our air, lay waste our forests, we are bad conservationists, and the ultimate penalty of bad conservation will be first, lives scarcely worth living, and finally extinction. The nondestructive use of natural resources—the major part of good conservation—is beautifully defined in a term that originated in forestry: "sustained yield."

If we practice "sustained yield," then we are good conservationists, and humankind can look forward to unlimited existence in an environment that will assure contentment and happiness.

Last month President Nixon publicly pledged that housing "is and must be a top national priority." He added that, "A major national resource—the productive capability of our private home building industry to meet our national housing needs—is being greatly threatened." I agree with the President's view.

The big thing in conservation is wise use of the things we possess. Merely to survive and to take care of our basic needs, one of which is housing, we must use our natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule and the legislation.

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

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman in the well for taking the leadership that he has in furthering this legislation.

I serve on the Committee on Banking and Currency and it was my privilege to sit through the hearings in which we discussed the overall aspects of the timber reserves of our country and the need for those reserves and how best to preserve them.

This legislation is the basic result of that series of hearings and I congratulate the gentleman on instituting those hearings and wish to associate myself with his remarks. I urge Members of the House to vote for the rule.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I do not normally oppose a rule on any bill. But this is a unique situation—I do oppose this rule and I shall ask for a rollcall vote on the rule.

I have argument with the motivation behind this piece of legislation. But this is not a good bill. It is so superficial and it is so lacking in comprehensiveness that it is impossible to make a good case for it.

This bill is not going to pass. If we debate this bill and fail to pass it, we will have a prejudice against a subsequent complete effort to legislate properly in this particular area.

This bill cannot achieve its purpose. If you heed nothing else that I present to you in these 5 minutes, I would have you hear this.

The biggest reason that this bill cannot work is simply the fact that its administration will be predicated on the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act. That act failed miserably.

As a matter of fact, if it had worked at all, we would have no need for the debate on this bill. That act has failed not because it did not have any money—not because it had insufficient funds—it failed rather because neither the Bureau of Land Management nor the Forest Service under that act, set any priorities on the use of the lands which are specified under Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act.

There are a lot of things wrong with this bill. Obviously, some public lands in the national forests are under the Bureau of Land Management, which incidentally is eliminated completely from this bill in spite of the fact that some of the best forests are on Bureau of Land Management lands.

Some of the lands are more productive in timber production than others, and yet if you check the records you will find that we have been spending, almost to the penny, the same amount of money for bad forest lands that we have been spending on good lands, and we have been spending an equal amount in all sections of the country, in spite of the fact that the best timber production occurs in specific areas, particularly some in the South and some in the extreme Northwest of the country.

This bill changes nothing in that respect.

The committee abandoned the principle of selecting specific sustained-yield acres for dominant timber production, obviously in an effort to placate some environmentalists, reservationists, conservationists—call them what you will—but they did not remove the objections, and in acceding to those demands they really killed the only chance they had of making this bill an effective means for sustained-yield harvest.

There are a lot of other things wrong with this bill. At the present time we build roads at the time the timber is harvested, because the money to build the roads comes from the harvest of the timber. If we would harvest mature timber—and, as the gentleman from Nebraska has said, we waste about 18 billion board feet of it a year—there would have to be a road in the forest to harvest that mature timber before it starts to rot or become diseased, or present a fire hazard.

The bill fails to take care of that problem. In fact, if you check to find how much money we spend in trying to keep an inventory of old growth timber, you will find that we lose more by several times than we actually receive through sale. I certainly agree with the gentleman on this point.

An earmarked fund is proposed, and I will tell you the danger that is involved in that. We established a land and water conservation fund, which was designed to beef up the purchase and acquisition of land for outdoor recreation. What happened? As soon as we set

up the earmarked fund for expenditures, we found that appropriations by the Congress are limited to that fund. They say, in effect, "You are going to get all your money out of that fund." Then the Budget Bureau comes along and says, "You are going to get only half the money you are supposed to have in that fund."

Setting up this fund creates an illusory benefit. It just will not occur.

This bill ignores fundamental economic matters, such as bidding, pricing, selling methods, and things such as the participation by counties, States, and localities, royalties and rents on the one hand and payment in lieu of taxes or revenue sharing on the other.

We have no facets in this bill which tell us whether or not the land should be purchased and, if so, under what conditions, how it should be disposed of and, if so, under what conditions. There are so many questions which are unanswered by this bill. Should we strive for a regional relocation of the timber industry with this device? Should we use Government lands through proprietary powers and enforce pollution standards on timber companies, even if the degradation comes over outside on public lands? Are we going to create a timber industry consisting of small operators, as has been suggested by someone this afternoon? Should we use the control over the markets to extract monopoly profits?

If the receipts under this bill are to be wholly or partly placed into a fund for expenditure on timber programs, then we have to have some economic guidelines which are not provided by this bill, such as maximization of net return to the Treasury, so we can first assure that the funds are expended for the best opportunities for growing timber; and even more importantly, some ways to make sure that these funds which become available are not considered to be properly spent only if they are expended on timber production.

We need a good, thorough legislative package for maximum public benefit in management of our forest values. This bill does not meet the criteria.

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

Mr. KYL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleague from Iowa in his remarks on the rule that is now before this body. The gentleman from Iowa is one of the able and one of the effective members of the Public Land Law Review Commission, and when he referred to the Public Land Law Review Commission as it pertains to this subject he referred to one of its studies and that is timber study which has been made. However, the report of the commission is not yet ready and will not be released to the President of the United States and to the Congress until June 30 of this year, at which time we will have the benefits of that study.

My colleague made a statement that this legislation was likely to be defeated. Would my colleague go a little further and state that if the bill does come to debate and it is defeated, such action may make it a little more difficult for the recommendations of the Public Land

Law Review Commission in this matter to be brought successfully before the Congress?

Mr. KYL. I agree completely with the gentleman from Colorado. At the beginning of my comments I pointed out the failure of this bill would prejudice consideration of appropriate and proper legislation when it should come before us.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the motives behind the introduction and the furtherance of this bill are in my opinion correct. What is wrong is to be found within the provisions of the legislation itself. This does not mean that I am critical of the committee handling the legislation. I believe that the consideration of this legislation is untimely as of this time.

What we have at the present time is an unnecessary controversy between the so-called preservationists and those who believe in the wise use of our natural resource values, including timber. This should not be a major part of the discussion on liquidation such as this if it can possibly be avoided. In my opinion, if this bill is not considered at this time, and it has to wait its turn for recommendation by the Public Land Law Review Commission, we will have a much better chance of reviewing this controversy, which is always a difficult one for the Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I am one who seldom opposes a rule, but in this particular instance I shall have to do so.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER).

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule on this bill, with all due deference to the bona fides and the sincerity of those who are proponents of the bill.

I think on its face it is a bad conservation measure, an ill-conceived conservation measure. I am concerned that we have not heard from the President's Environmental Quality Council on this bill, which has obvious environmental considerations, and I am concerned we have not heard from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Interior on this bill, as I understand the law mandates.

I am especially wondrous as to why the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Mr. Romney, has not given us his point of view on this bill, because the justification for this has been, to a considerable measure, its housing implications, the fact that more lumber must be made available to fill our growing needs for housing for an expanding population with more disposable net income available for shelter than we have ever had in the past, and more urgent desire to improve the quality of our homes than we have ever known in the past.

I would like to speak specifically on the housing implications of this bill, since there are many others in this Chamber who know far more than I do about conservation. I can say from experience that this proposed law is not

only a poor conservation measure, but it is also a poor housing measure.

In the half century since 1920, we have doubled our population and quintupled our gross national product, and we have built more than 50 million homes to meet the great expanding needs for shelter in this country, greater than anything this globe has ever known. Yet in that period of time the annual production of forest products—lumber and other forest products—has remained substantially stable and level.

Why? The reason is obvious. It is that we have developed alternatives to lumber, many of them more durable and many of them less expensive, and many of them more amenable to the mass production, automated processes about which we have heard so very much from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. Speaker, we have a new housing program called Project Breakthrough that is designed to apply mass production, factory, industrial methods to the production of housing. If we are really serious about making more housing available faster and more cheaply, then we will do something about encouraging the production of lumber substitutes. We will do something about the development of better means to produce plastic and aluminum sidings which are already in use.

We will try to develop better means of producing metal roofing, metal studs, and metal joists, which are already in use experimentally.

We will do something to encourage development of synthetic lumber from resins and acrylic foams, and do something to encourage the use of precast concrete forms of all kinds.

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

Mr. SCHEUER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman speaks about substitutes for floor joists, riprap, steel joists, and so forth, and steel and aluminum to replace lumber. I should like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact, from personal knowledge in this field, that the substitutes he speaks about are considerably higher in price than lumber. The cost of construction today is so high, with money and so forth—and many other factors—that house construction is going down.

I would negate the gentleman's argument in this area.

Mr. SCHEUER. My colleague is correct that some of these elements are more expensive than the lumber, but, for one thing, they make possible far swifter construction. The savings in taxes during construction, the savings in interest during construction, the savings in security protection and weather damage during construction are far more than the magnitude of the somewhat extra cost of the lumber substitute.

Second, may I suggest to my colleague that when the time comes when we are really in mass production of these lumber substitutes and have developed them to the point where they are applicable to producing moderate income housing by the millions annually—and we need

production of 2 million units annually—then at that time it is quite obvious to me the application of mass production techniques to these lumber substitutes will bring down the price below the price of lumber.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, we are here facing a bill of major importance to this Congress and to this Nation. It is the sort of bill which has so very much at stake that to attempt to determine its fate in the few minutes which are available to this House in debating the rule would be to shortchange the Nation.

We have here heard several people rise and raise what I am sure each of them personally believes to be an objection to this measure. But what we are facing is a series of statements, alleging things about this measure which the makers feel earnestly but which, if we have an opportunity to deal with item by item, I am certain can be answered and will be answered.

The suggestion has been made that before there is an opportunity to deal with these charges, to deal with these allegations item by item, the bill be killed by virtue of killing the rule. I would urge this body today not to take that sort of shortsighted action.

We are here facing a situation that does not deal with one section of the country. I come from an area that is deeply involved in the production of the raw material of the forest. If it were just those of us who come from the areas where the timber is grown, which is involved so deeply in this bill, who care about its passage or who should care about its passage, then any count of noses or count of those who are from other areas as contrasted with those of us who are from the producing areas would inexorably say we would lose.

But anybody who will look at this bill and look at its history and what it truly proposes to do must come to the conclusion that there is much more involved here than the interests of timber-producing areas. We are here not only concerned about the timber-producing areas and what is important to those areas, but we are also concerned about the areas which have in the past had vast stands of timber, areas like so many parts of the Middle West where we are dealing with great forests which are no longer great forests because of past cutting practices, but which badly need help to return once again to their position of producing areas. Some of the southlands are in the same condition and some of the forests of the Rocky Mountains bid fair to be in this condition, to say nothing of some of the forests of California. There are a host of acres in this country which have the potential to be once again great producing lands and which need this bill.

But there is a third group, and here is where so many people in this House were deeply concerned about this a year ago and now suddenly, with the crisis past, they forget that a year ago they were concerned about it. At that time prices for the raw materials of the for-

ests were suddenly beginning to climb because of supply and demand. With a steady fixed supply of lumber and plywood so necessary to meet construction needs we were finding the demand was suddenly cutting across the supply curve, and in the free economy with which we deal prices were taking off, rising rapidly. Then suddenly the Members of this body who come from the urban areas and who live in areas which see a great need for housing in this country and see that the housing production in this country today is at but a fraction—less than 50 percent—of the goal that was set in the Housing Act of 1968, became aware of the fact that unless something like what this bill proposes was to be done, we would find ourselves unable to meet the housing goals established in the Housing Act of 1968.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have time to talk about all of the individual charges in these few minutes that are made available under the debate on the rule.

There has been a reference to what the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Mr. Romney, has said on this particular matter. He favors it.

There have been five committees of this Congress who have held hearings on this particular measure. This began almost 2 years ago. We need to bring out in debate what those hearings demonstrated about the need for this bill.

Let me close by saying this: It is important that this rule pass.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE).

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, because the impact of the timber bill (H.R. 12025) would tend to be heaviest in the Pacific Northwest, where the timber industry plays a major role in the local economy, I find it significant that the news media in the Northwest are asking some basic questions about the bill.

"Timber Act Not OK Yet" is how the Oregonian, a newspaper long noted for its sympathetic coverage of timber industry news, headlined its lead editorial on February 15, 1970. The editors observe that H.R. 12025 would create a basic discrimination among forest uses to favor logging, in direct contradiction of the multiple-use principle. The editors see through the industry's specious claim that the bill is compatible with multiple use. The Oregonian says:

Certainly, intensified management of the national forests is a national need. But so are the other varied uses of the national forests. The least that could be done would be to give the Forest Service authority to use earmarked funds for multiple purposes, not solely for timber cutting.

Not only this newspaper, but many newspapers throughout the country, such as the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, have expressed similar opposition to this bill.

Frankly, I see more basic fallacies in the legislation than the Oregonian does; I nonetheless agree with the editors that the bill's intent is good, but its basic approach is all wrong. H.R. 12025 should be returned to committee for a thorough revision.

I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

TIMBER ACT NOT OK YET

The Nixon Administration missed the boat in failing to make its weight felt from the beginning in the drafting or rewriting in committee of what started out as the industry-promoted National Forest Timber Supply Act of 1969 and has been renamed the National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act of 1969.

The Forest Service did take exception to provisions in the original bill and conservation groups have fought that and the amended bill. The Bureau of the Budget, for one, did not and probably does not now like the dedication of 65 per cent of national forest earnings from timber sales to a special fund for intensified timber management, a fund which would continue to be subject, however, to congressional appropriation with the unexpended surpluses being returned to the Treasury.

There remains a feeling in the Forest Service that the amended bill is "timber oriented" and that it may not help in getting money, outside the dedicated fund for timber management, for recreation projects in the national forests. But the Forest Service and Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin have announced their support of the amended bill. So has Secretary of Housing George Romney. The Budget Bureau may have been overruled.

Obviously, President Nixon has decided that conservation and other opposition is outweighed by the opportunity provided in the bill to increase annual timber production in the national forests from 13.4 billion board feet to around 20 billion board feet. This kind of management will be necessary if the President's goal of 26 million new and rehabilitated dwellings by 1978 is to be achieved.

The national forests contain 53 per cent of the nation's standing softwood timber but now are marketing only 30 per cent of the nation's softwood production.

Regional Forester Charles Connaughton is authority for the statement that Oregon and Washington national forests could increase production by one-third by intensifying management. Nationally, the Forest Service gets only enough money from Congress to reforest 40 per cent of the land logged. It could increase production immediately by thinning and salvage if it had the money. Of course, the Forest Service will continue to be dependent upon congressional appropriations if the management bill is adopted.

Increases in timber sales, of course, will augment the 25 percent share in revenues which go to Oregon and other counties.

The bill, H.R. 12025, by reference in three places, purports not to interfere with the Multiple Use Act of 1960, nor does it amend the Wilderness Act or the National Scenic Trails and Wild and Scenic Rivers acts. But neither does it propose any new revenues for such purposes. Earmarked funds could not, for example, be used for campgrounds or other recreational purposes.

The legislation, if it survives in the House without amendment, may be altered in the Senate or in conference committee. Certainly, intensified management of the national forests is a national need. But so are the other varied uses of the national forests. The least that could be done would be to give the Forest Service authority to use earmarked funds for multiple purposes, not solely for timber cutting.

I urge defeat of this bill.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN).

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the fundamental axioms that the ecologists are trying to drive home to us has to do with that old saw about haste making waste. Many of the environmental problems we face have been created be-

cause we have ignored that maxim. We have acted hastily and wastefully, and the consequences are all around us. The ecologists are trying to make us understand that we must break the habit of simply barging ahead, heedless of the long-term consequences, where the earth and its resources are concerned.

I have tried to keep an open mind about this bill, studying it with deep concern both for the protection of our natural resources and for the meeting of our human needs. It seems clear to me that the balance of the argument at this time is against enacting it into law, at least pending the report of the President's Task Force on Housing, which was appointed specifically to gather information about this problem. I am, therefore, opposed to granting the rule because to consider this proposed legislation now would be at best premature and precipitate and at worst irresponsible and dangerous. Haste in this case could make for irreparable waste.

The President's task force will report its findings soon, and then we will have additional facts to help us determine the future timber needs of the country for housing and other valid purposes. The presumptions in this kind of situation must be against anything that might endanger the multiple purposes and uses of our forests and other resources; but fair-minded men will be willing to study the task force report as part of the evidence on which to base their final judgment on this legislation. But why we should be asked to vote for this bill today is a mystery to me.

The bill should not have been brought up today, and if the rule is granted, I for one, as a member of the Agriculture Committee, will do everything I can to see that it is defeated.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT).

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman desires, I will yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT) is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I would point out to you that what my beloved former chairman, WAYNE ASPINALL, and my very much respected colleague, JOHN KYL, have said here, particularly the points that JOHN KYL raised, point up the absolute necessity of granting this rule so that we can get into the consideration of this legislation and discuss the various points in order to see after some meaningful debate just exactly what is contained in the bill and come to our own conclusions as to whether the bill accomplishes its stated purposes or not.

Mr. Speaker, I would also refer to the remarks of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER) who said he wanted the opinion of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK) has given that, another reason for adopting the rule so we can discuss the matter on its merits and find out exactly what Mr. Romney has said about the desperate need for this bill. He also indicated that there has been no increase in softwood for home construction during the past

several years. The facts, actually, are otherwise and will be brought out during the debate.

In fact, we have had a 23-percent increase in the use of softwood in construction in just the past 18 years. The gentleman from New York also says we need time to develop substitutes. I would like to inquire how much time we need during which to develop substitutes. Do we wait until we stop home construction before we commence planning?

Mr. Speaker, in 1968 we pledged to build 2.6 million units of housing per year for a period of 10 years. We are now building houses in this country at the rate of approximately 1.1 million per year. If we are to meet the commitments, if we are to meet our housing pledges, we will very shortly be faced with the necessity of building houses at a rate in excess of 3 million, perhaps as high as 3.5 million per year. When you add the enormous demands on the supply of wood that will be created in this housing market, we certainly need a bill of this type and we certainly should have the rule so we can discuss the matter on its merits.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand an editorial from the Times Standard of California entitled "No Lesson From Tillamook?" As you will recall there was the incredibly vast Tillamook burn in northwestern Oregon in 1933. That area is located in my congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, I shall read into the RECORD at this point very pertinent excerpts from that editorial:

The bill also designated that it would apply only to those areas of national forests already designated as commercial timber lands, and would not alter those designated for wilderness areas, parks or other restricted-use areas.

The conservationists countered with assertions that increased timber production would mean the building of more access roads. True. This is a vital part of the intent, in order to speed lumber production to ease the critical housing shortage throughout the United States . . . and for another good reason.

What the conservationists did not mention is that the incredibly vast Tillamook Burn in northwestern Oregon in 1933 was the greatest natural disaster through fire in American history. Damage caused in this blaze which destroyed billions of feet of prime virgin timber, made the dollar cost of the Chicago fire look like peanuts. The reason why it burned over so many miles and so many days is that—there were no forest roads to enable fire-fighting equipment to get in.

The bill came as no surprise to anyone. It was the result of extensive Congressional hearings last year in which it was determined that restriction of federal timber production was a direct cause of the serious lumber and plywood shortages and the subsequent inflationary rise in prices.

The national forests contain more than half of the country's saw timber; in California they hold nearly 60 per cent, yet they produce less than 40 per cent of the annual yield. Commercial operators on private lands would go dead broke at that rate.

So the conservationists fear roads. We remind them of Tillamook.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the emotional character of the opposition to this bill. Wild and wholly false charges have been made about the purposes and effects of this proposed bill. These have served to inflame opinion among many

dedicated and responsible conservationists.

On a matter this important to the present and to future generations, we must let reason, not emotion, rule. The loud and shrill voices must not be allowed to prevail over facts and carefully reasoned logic.

APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS

My time will only permit me to cover two points which I consider very important, and others among my colleagues will cover the balance of the spectrum.

As a new member of the Appropriations Committee last year, I was privileged to serve on the Subcommittee on Interior Affairs. The Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management are both under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee. Although I had understood the appropriations process in a general way, I was simply appalled to observe in detail how the dollars we in Congress allocated to the management of our renewable natural resources had to compete with dollars we appropriated for all other purposes of the Federal Government, so many of them being totally unproductive.

There has been no real differentiation between programs like our forest programs which return to the Government several times the amount we allocate to them, and programs on which there is absolutely no return to the Federal Government.

Private timber corporations have awakened to the renewable nature of their great timber assets. They are growing timber as a crop. They are fully reforesting their high growth lands. The days of the private operator who in days long past, cut and run, are gone. Private corporations are managed for a profit, and the way to insure a profit is to guarantee sustained yield on their high growth land perpetually. The Federal Government should come into the 20th century in its forest management practices, and this act will make this possible. Under our present system, the very most conservative forest management practices must be followed because of the fact that future funding is wholly dependent upon the ups and downs of the present appropriations process. Growing timber is a business, and it should be handled as a business.

NEW FOREST MANAGEMENT PURPOSE

My second point: As we enter the decade of the 1970's, it is evident that a new purpose for the management of our Federal forests must be given consideration. To those of you who were aware of the lumber and plywood price crisis less than 1 year ago, I suggest that you not be lulled into complacency by the fact that prices have since eased considerably. You no doubt have noticed another parallel occurrence. Housing starts have dropped dramatically.

Although we have not yet come close to meeting our housing commitments made in 1968 of 2.6 million units per year for 10 years, the day is lurking around the corner when the push for housing will even exceed 2.6 million units to make up for our failures in the past 2 years. Then the boom will really be on. The demand for timber and timber products will make last spring's price upheaval

look like a gradual market adjustment. Those who argue that the return to normalcy of lumber and plywood prices, those who argue that wood substitutes will do the job, had better be prepared to explain what happened when this housing boom starts.

The black teenager in the ghettos owns just as big a share of our Federal timber as the wealthiest backpacker. The availability of vast wilderness areas to this teenager will mean little if he continues to live in a dirty hovel, and we fail in our national commitment to provide decent shelter for him. With the guarantees in this bill, he, and all other Americans can have both decent housing and millions of acres of wilderness and recreation land.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule to bring this bill before this body for full discussion. I represent an area in California, that has 10 full national forests and parts of four others and an area where the Federal Forest Service has under its jurisdiction about 16 million acres of land.

These lands are very high producing lands in the timbered areas of the United States. At the present time we cut about 4 billion board feet of timber from these lands.

When the new administration came into office and the matter of the housing shortage and the high cost of building materials was before us, many of the Members went to the new administration, met with the Bureau of the Budget people, the Director and his staff, met with the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Hardin, and his staff, the Chief of the Forest Service, and with a White House task force that was set up by President Nixon. We discussed this matter very thoroughly. When we came back and asked in the appropriations for fiscal 1970 for additional funds for the Forest Service to do a proper job in the management of the timberlands of the United States.

The Congress and the Bureau of the Budget recognized this need and granted some additional funds. Those funds were well spent, and the results will speak for themselves.

Now, certainly, Mr. Speaker, I would do nothing to denude the forests on our timbered areas. Primarily nearly all of the forests in my district are second-growth or third-growth timber, but at the same time we have a great recreational development and participation in the forested lands.

At the present time there are Federal lands that are given additional consideration that are held by the military in this very area that we are speaking about—or would speak about if the rule were to be granted, and we had opportunity to discuss this bill, and they are showing outstanding results. We have the same practices being carried on in the Bureau of Land Management with

some of the best land in the Nation, as far as timber production is concerned.

There is nothing in this bill that would allow for the cutting of timber in wilderness areas. There is nothing in this bill that would allow for any timber to be harvested in our national parks. A lot of this is misinformation, and I think a full discussion of the bill before this body would be very beneficial for all of us.

I realize that the Public Land Law Review Commission has made a very thorough study, and so has the President of the United States, in setting up a task force, but since that time the administration, the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the Forest Service, are supporting the bill that is proposed to be taken up if the rule is granted. I do hope that this body will adopt this rule and allow us to have a full discussion on this matter.

I do believe that there is more being taken out of the forests today than ever in the history of the forests for many reasons. Much of the material that is taken used to be left in the forests, but today we take it in. So I think that all of the things that will be provided for in the bill in the way of intensified management will be under the control and jurisdiction of the Forest Service, and certainly they are experienced hands.

We have some of the best professional foresters working in the Federal Service that I know of. I know of no supervisor in my area, nor the Regional Forester, nor the Chief of the Forest Service, who have any objection to this bill being brought to this body, and if passed by this body they could administer it in a very fine manner for the betterment of all of our people.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

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

You know, Mr. Speaker, I sat here and listened to all the arguments about this being a terrible bill—a horrible bill—and that it is not a good bill, and there are a lot of things wrong with it, but I have not heard one single thing pointed out about this bill that would hold water except the gentleman a while ago who said he did not want wood for competition for synthetics. That is the only argument I have heard that would hold any water.

Now I have been curious enough and I would like to see the rule granted so that some of these people who are opposed to this bill would give some solid reason why.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself my remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to an error made a few moments ago by the gentleman from New York in his remarks in which he stated that Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Romney, was not in favor of this legislation.

If the gentleman will consult the tes-

timony given by Secretary Romney before the Committee on Banking and Currency this week, the Secretary stated that he wholeheartedly and completely and unreservedly supported this legislation and that it was vitally needed if we were to take care of the housing demands in future years.

I suggest that the gentleman consult and look up Mr. Romney's testimony before the Committee on Banking and Currency, which is completely opposite to the statement he made in the well of the House a few moments ago.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a couple of words in conclusion and then I expect to move the previous question.

Without getting into the merits, let me simply say to my friends, I think in all fairness this bill should be permitted to be discussed by the committee having jurisdiction. I think the thoughts and the expressions by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BELCHER) could be well taken. The facts are known, and the opposition so far today has not presented one single argument against the bill other than to say that it is a bad bill.

Now maybe they have some good and justifiable arguments to make. So it would seem to me they would like to have the right to make them, if they have such arguments.

Certainly I think the Committee on Agriculture, which will be handling the bill, should have the right at least to present the bill on its merits, and then let us vote it up or down.

My only plea, Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues is at least let us vote for the rule and permit the committee to make its case and then judge the bill on the merits of that case.

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

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my great concern over the controversy surrounding the intent and purpose of this bill. As one of the original cosponsors of this legislation, I have studied and restudied the language of the bill and I conclude that there are areas which remain open to doubt or which could possibly be misinterpreted. I believe that the bill should be clarified to remove these doubts before consideration by the House.

The bill was originally, and remains, timber oriented, assigning timber yield a preferred, privileged position over other uses. Conservation interests were to be protected by directing that the act would be administered in conformity with the Multiple Use Act of 1960. But this is in itself an ambiguity for the Multiple Use Act clearly states that no special emphasis shall be given to any single use whether it be timber, recreation, wildlife, et cetera.

I believe that if we are to pass a National Forest Timber and Conservation Act then we are going to have to include equal emphasis on the conservation end—or are we going to have to draft in the future a National Watershed Supply Act, a National Wildlife Supply Act, a National Forage Supply Act, and a National Recreation Act?

It was my intention to offer specific amendments to this bill which I believed would prescribe that no increase in timber cutting would be allowed beyond sustained yield limitations. Another amendment would have directed that 25 percent of the gross returns from timber sales rather than the net, be assigned to local county roads and schools. However, it has come to my attention that these amendments would have been unacceptable to the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I want a bill which will provide reforestation of denuded areas in our national forests. But even here this bill falls short. Reforestation is limited to only "better-site" lands which are commercially profitable. It does not provide for reforestation of devastated areas where tree planting might be necessary to improve watershed, wildlife protection or recreational values.

Another failure of this particular bill is that there is no specific guarantee to exclude roads and logging operations from de facto wilderness areas presently unprotected.

For these reasons then, the present bill should be recommended to the Agriculture Committee, at least until the Public Land Law Review Commission report is presented to the Congress in June of this year, and a consensus of opinion can be reached to resolve the broader issues surrounding this bill.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, this is an agriculture bill because it is concerned with growing a crop to meet the needs of the people of the United States. It is the function of the Agriculture Committee to consider and act upon such legislation. But this bill is not only concerned with an essential crop, but with an even more critical matter, adequate housing for our citizens whether they reside in big cities, little towns, or in isolated rural farmhouses.

The National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act had its origins not in the Agriculture Committee—although trees are a crop which can be planted, cultivated, harvested, and replanted like any other crop—but in the Housing Subcommittees of both the House and the Senate Banking and Currency Committees. This is a measure which may well determine whether our great country will be able to fulfill the aspirations of our citizens for a decent place to live. It is a bill, which I had the privilege to introduce—with cosponsors—which may well determine whether you and I, our neighbors here in Washington, or our friends and constituents back home, may ever realize the ultimate ambition of every husband and wife—decent housing, in which they can rear their children with pride and in comfort. This enlightened legislation will enable all of the people to realize the benefits of the forest bounty which they have paid for, which they own, and which they need to have converted to their use and enjoyment—the timber standing and to be grown forever on the commercial timber lands of our national forests.

The concept of this bill was first enunciated nearly 15 months ago in the other body when the Senate Small Business Committee interested itself in the capability of our Nation to meet its riding

demand for timber products. It emerged again, 4 months later in both the Senate and the House Banking and Currency Committees when anxieties about soaring prices for lumber and plywood—sorely needed for home construction—demanded congressional investigation. Both bodies were properly concerned that high prices for these basic building materials—lumber and plywood—were denying our people the opportunity for shelter.

Investigations by these congressional committees were intensively conducted into the practices of the manufacturers and distributors. Charges were leveled by the Nation's homebuilders and other wood product users. All of the charges were forthrightly answered by those who convert timber to useful products. It became clear that the Federal Government itself—owner of more than 50 percent of the entire Nation's existing softwood sawtimber inventory—was a principal factor in restraining timber supplies and thus forcing price rises which were blunting housing efforts. The Congress, on both sides, determined to do something about it. This bill is the fruit of those earnest labors. It pleads for immediate passage in the interest of adequate housing for every man, woman, and child in America.

This bill, when introduced in the House of Representatives, won 67 cosponsors; members of both parties, men and women from rural and urban communities, members from timber-producing and end-product consuming States. Thus it is truly a bill in the total public interest. I am proud to be its sponsor and to have the privilege of managing it here on the floor.

Let me quickly review the attention this measure has won. It is not a 24-hour sensation. It is the result of more than 15 months of painstaking examination of its merits. It has been the subject of five separate congressional hearings, covering 13 full days. The testimony from more than 200 expert witnesses has been expressed in more than 2,600 pages of testimony. Its broad intent has been the subject of a special White House task force headed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. It has been thoroughly examined in the press, radio, and television of the Nation. The time has clearly come for action if we are not only to build the houses the country needs but to guarantee that future generations will know the pleasures not only of adequate housing but the multiple benefits of regenerated timber resources.

There may be those who will say, "We must wait until the White House task force has rendered a judgment." That judgment was to have been forthcoming 6 months ago. Insofar as I know, none of us has seen it.

I have seen, however, this statement by the chairman of that task force, The Honorable Robert Mayo, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, a man whose prudence we all respect. He said last November:

Since April, attention has been devoted more to the longer range problem, with the major objective of insuring that the available supply of softwood timber and its products would not impose a serious constraint on the achievement of the Nation's housing

needs. We also have been concerned with avoiding a repetition of the sharp swing in prices that occurred during 1968 and 1969. Price gyrations have a disturbingly disruptive effect not only on the housing industry, but also on employment and earnings in the timber industry. . . .

During the years immediately ahead—what economists call the short run—the demand/supply imbalance in softwood timber is likely to be the most acute. In this period, say, from 1971 to 1975, short supplies of softwood timber and substitutes could retard housing construction and increase the cost of satisfying the Nation's housing needs unless effective programs are developed to expand timber availability. That is to say with housing construction expected to expand rapidly as soon as financial conditions ease, it is necessary that we substantially increase the available supply of softwood timber. Current estimates indicate that softwood requirements may increase by as much as 6 to 8-billion board feet by 1973. Against the current level of output of 50-million board feet, this is clearly a major challenge to all of us—to government and to business.

And, at this juncture, Mr. Mayo came to the heart of the current proposed legislation. He said:

Of the sources of supply directly controlled by the Federal government, the national forests offer the principal possibility for expansion of softwood timber.

He subsequently said:

National policy must be concerned with improving both growth and utilization of our timber resources.

And added:

We should encourage the Forest Service to push ahead with the development of programs to increase timber yields from the national forests and achieve a truly significant increase in timber harvest over the next decade.

I submit to this body that the purpose and intent of H.R. 12025 is to achieve this noble purpose. I would remind this body, as well, that national policy with respect to national resources is not only a prerogative of the Congress of the United States, but an obligation. It is our duty to pass this bill to meet the present needs of all of our people and to guarantee that the future needs of our people will be met.

This bill, carefully conceived, fully debated in committee, and subjected to long examination and alteration to overcome any flaws, meets all the criteria for passage.

It meets a current public need—housing.

It guarantees fulfillment of a future public need—timber resources.

It adheres to the mandate that public dollars should be subject to the appropriations process.

It is limited in its scope to only the national forest that grows commercial timber and does not restrict the right of either the Forest Service or the Congress to withdraw lands from timber-growing wilderness on other nontimber uses.

It specifically establishes that national forest timber management will be subject to the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960 which directs that all uses of the national forests—recreation, watershed, timber, grazing, and fish and wildlife—shall be considered in their management.

I might add that it was the Agriculture Committee, the advocate of the

present bill, which brought the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act to the floor of the House 10 years ago and successfully sought its adoption as a fundamental of national resource policy.

This present act, the National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act, provides for the reinvestment of timber sales receipts for the application of certain specified timber management and production practices on the National Forest commercial timberlands. At the same time, it rigorously protects the options of the administration, the Appropriations Committees, and the Congress as to the worth of such practices in the public interest.

H.R. 12025 is a worthy bill. It deserves prompt adoption by this distinguished House.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, recently I applauded a postponement of House consideration of H.R. 12025, the National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act. In principal, I certainly do not oppose legislation of this kind, because our national forests are going to have to contribute more to the needs of the national forest products industry. We have been operating on the basis of a 100-year growth cycle and this is not realistic.

But there is not any immediate urgency such as existed when the bill was first introduced and which caused me to cosponsor it.

In other words, in 1968 and early 1969, there was a real squeeze in the availability of logs for production of softwood and plywood due to log exports and heavy snows in logging areas. Also, there was a shortage of railroad boxcars and all in all a sharp increase in prices resulted. But, of course, subsequently these prices collapsed when the expected housing boom did not materialize due to high interest rates and the decline in demand for homebuilding.

I am not suggesting that the day will not come—and soon, I hope—when money will ease and the demand for timber for housing will increase. But, what we will need is good legislation that is vital to the economy and good legislation with respect to the ecology.

My grave fear is that this legislation as it now reads may not be in the public interest in the long run since it would go a long way toward setting a policy that Federal forests lands shall be managed solely for commercial timber production. I say this as a conscientious supporter of the multiple-use concept of forest management, Mr. Speaker.

It is interesting to note, too, reaction to this bill from some of the newspapers of wood-producing areas, such as Eugene and Medford in Oregon, and Lewiston, Idaho. The theme of their articles has been "What this country needs is a good timber supply and conservation law," and they agree that H.R. 12025 as reported is not that kind of a law.

Meanwhile, it should be remembered that the Public Land Law Review Commission will submit its recommendations to Congress and to President Nixon before June 30, which will cover laws and rules and regulations on national forests and wildlife refuges and ranges. Again, I say, I support the concept of this bill, but it seems to me wise to delay any leg-

islation such as this until after we have that report, so I favor recommitment temporarily of this legislation to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I think any legislation should assign a substantial percentage of funds from proceeds of sale of timber for recreation and wildlife conservation and in addition it should require that before this act could be implemented in any national forest, the Secretary of Agriculture would have to consult with the Secretary of Interior and the head of the agencies exercising administration over wildlife resources of the particular State involved. This consultation would at least give conservation interests an avenue through which to present their views to the Secretary of Agriculture before any action is begun.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, many of our fellow conservationists throughout the country are deeply disturbed by the National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act of 1969, now before the House.

I have received many communications and visits from dedicated individuals and groups expressing strong opposition. Some of them, recognized as experts in the field, consider the bill to be just the opposite of good conservation practices, and have pointed out their fear that the bill could work great damage to our forests and public domains and set back the cause of constructive conservation and protection of our natural resources for many years to come.

It is unquestionable that certain business and industrial interests are pressing their case on the basis of what is good for them in the first instance, and not necessarily what is good for our national forests and the implementation of enlightened conservation policies.

In some conceivable instances, if the green light is given to private, economic interests to move into our great national forests and indiscriminately cut off massive acreage without proper regard for the present and the future of our national forests, great harm can be done. Thus, we will be setting back sound conservation programs stemming from years and years of sustained effort to insure that the principles of sound conservation shall come before the type of inadequately regulated commercial exploitation that in the opinion of experts in this field might well do irreparable damage to basic conservation plans and practices.

For example, to increase the allowable cut by commercial interests for profit with little or no regard for other multiple use values would be, so the experts tell us, to negate and deemphasize our total conservation programs in this vital area.

Many of us are disturbed no end by the increase in the annual cutting in national forests at the rate of over 5 billion feet per year until it will reach 12 billion board feet per year in the next 10 years. This is very disturbing.

Moreover, the evidence shows that high quality timber is being grossly overcut, and that practice is being justified by growth estimates of marginal timber areas in high elevation on unsuitable

soils, and by curtailing established rotation periods.

It should also be noted that this bill definitely moves toward unprecedented overcutting of our most valuable forests. If Congress permits these practices to go forward unchecked at accelerated rates, the results, from a national standpoint, would be a serious depletion of our forest preserves, and would cause us to turn our backs in these days of crises, inflation, and upset upon fundamental conservation policies that should and must be continued, if we are going to have any hope of holding the line against those in our exploitative society casting greedy eyes at our most precious, national resource and then raiding them.

Some of the greatest conservationists in the country are opposing this bill, and as one long dedicated to conservation principles, I do not propose to support any bill which moves in the direction of converting the Forest Service into an agency for promoting private exploitation, ignoring proper rehabilitation of forest lands, and unwisely depleting our timber supply.

I do not believe that any opposition could reasonably be urged to forestry practices that may entail cutting out old growth, decaying timber, or thinning, or weeding, and cutting back growth overage that is impeding the overall growth of good trees in the forests.

Reforestation is another practice that is part of our conservation program and must be encouraged, and these practices are very important. But first we must make sure that the forests themselves are not being stripped needlessly by massive, nonselective cutting of all growth for commercial purposes.

No one objects to measures that are designed to cut out and remove dead and dying trees and generally clean up the forests, and hence promote more favorable conditions for better growth. That is an essential part of our conservation program, as is reforestation, and I do not believe these measures have been pressed in recent years to the extent that they should be, and more attention must be given to these techniques.

There are also, of course, the problems of protecting wildlife, developing and controlling additional supplies of water, and where possible, building access passage of waterways for public recreation and enjoyment, and other urgently needed forest conservation and management problems.

I am in complete agreement with the need for continuing all these good programs and implementing them, but I cannot tolerate or support the wholesale nonselective cutting down and ravaging of our wonderful national forest growths with disregard of basic conservation principles in order to promote commercial exploitation of forest lands without due regard to the public interest and sound conservation.

For these and other reasons, I am unable to support this bill under the current circumstances and urge that it be taken off the House calendar and returned to the committee. Unless drastic amendment of this bill is made, it should be retained in the committee indefinitely.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I join

many of my colleagues in opposing H.R. 12025, the National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act of 1969. I urge those of you who have not made up your minds on this legislation to vote against it. Contrary to the impression given by the title of this bill, it will not lead to better conservation of our valuable national forests. It will not lead to better management of our national forests. Rather, this bill will pressure the U.S. Forest Service to give in to the immediate desires of the lumber industry. It will make it harder to uphold the longer range goals stated in the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960 governing the use of our national forests, outdoor recreation, range land, timber use, watershed protection, and protection of fish and wildlife.

The basic complaint of the lumber industry in pressing this legislation is that they do not have enough lumber. Even if this were true today, I do not believe that the answer to this complaint would be to raid our national forests.

We have learned this year that our environment faces a challenge from the activities of man that it may well be unable to withstand. Public and private leaders have shown us the costs of the neglect of our fragile interconnected world. The abuse of our atmosphere with the internal combustion engine, the spilling of our lakes and rivers with the wastes of our communities, the indiscriminate use of chemicals in industry and agriculture all threaten our existence. If these warnings mean anything, they mean that we can no longer take for granted the natural world that we inhabit. We must carefully consider the effects of our actions on our world if we are to survive.

In the year 1970 I believe that we ought to be looking at our national forests to determine whether we should reduce rather than increase the amount of commercial activity that we allow within them. We have already learned of the ominous threat to some of our national forests from air pollution. The Angeles National Forest on the edge of the Los Angeles basin has thousands of fir trees that are dying as a result of the air pollution found in the basin. In other forests, such as the Tonto National Forest, we find the managers spraying plant-killing chemicals on brush and trees with resulting danger to both humans and animal life. If anything, I believe that we ought to be asking whether we need national green belts close to our metropolitan areas as a part of a national growth plan.

In those countries where forests do not grow in sufficient quantity we find both the governments and private industry taking steps to plant new forests. The Dutch have recently planted a large forest in part of their reclaimed land for use as pulpwood. Many other countries in the Middle East have extensive reforestation projects which they recognize as necessary for a balanced environment. If we did not have our national forests, we would be spending money to create them. This is also another reason for not allowing the indiscriminate cutting of our forests in light of immediate pressures.

The shortsightedness of the lumber industry can best be seen in the arguments that they have advanced for this bill. They argue that national housing needs will not be met if we do not increase the production of lumber. Yet the trend in housing is not toward increased use of lumber but rather the reverse. Increasingly, the low-cost home is a mobile home or a modular unit constructed with cement. As a recent study pointed out, the total annual consumption of timber has remained stable for the past 70 years. In fact, we actually used less lumber in 1967 than we did at the turn of the century.

The lumber industry also claimed that their product was being priced out of the market because of a sharp increase that had occurred at the time this bill was introduced. The weakness of this argument was revealed when lumber prices plummeted during the last 18 months. Today, lumber prices are considerably lower than when the bill was introduced. This is partially due to the lag in housing that is now troubling our Nation. But this change does show that increased cutting of timber in national forests may have only a marginal effect on timber prices.

It is my belief that our needs for national forests and the ways in which we use them must be reevaluated in light of the overall needs of our society. Our national forest, as opposed to those held privately, have value that transcends their use as sources of timber or grazing land. It may well be that their value in replenishing and balancing our atmosphere, in sorting and purifying our water, and in separating our metropolitan areas is irreplaceable. Until we know what the ecological balance should be between forest land and a population of 300 million, anticipated at the end of this century, I do not believe that we should approve heavier cutting of our national forests.

I urge all those who share my concerns to vote against H.R. 12025.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise in support of the National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act of 1969, which will provide for more intensive management, accelerated growth, and increased timber production from the Nation's national forest system. Along with several of my colleagues, I am a cosponsor of this measure and worked on this legislation in the Agriculture Committee.

I feel very strongly that this legislation is needed for the long-range supply of timber in America. The bill will also help to prevent possible drastic increases in timber prices in the future such as happened in 1968 and the first part of 1969. In this respect, this bill is highly important in our fight against inflation.

The achievement of a sustained yield requires the orderly conversion of timber into a balanced structure of timber age classes so that in each year or period a new crop of timber matures and is ready for harvesting. According to some wildlife experts, this sustained-yield concept is also helpful to animal life in their efforts to forage for food in the forests. I feel H.R. 12025 has the necessary built-in provisions for protection of our national forests from the standpoint of

realistic reforestation and management policies. These provisions were added in order to protect our national forests in the areas of recreation, wildlife, and watershed development.

Another important point of this legislation is the provision for the establishment of a fund for financing timber growing practices which, for the most part, are not now being conducted on national forest lands. The fund would be supplied from 65 percent of the cash receipts from the sale of national forest timber. The remaining 35 percent would continue to be designated for distribution to counties or parishes in which the national forests are located for schools and roads and to the national forest roads and trails fund. The act would lead to substantial increases in the amount going to the counties.

One other important point of this measure is the section assuring small business concerns of being able to obtain that proportion of the total timber sold annually which represents their collective average percentage of timber from each national forest over the preceding 3 calendar years. This provision will make certain that a fair amount of national forest timber sales will go to the small business concerns as has been the case in the past.

I respect the view of those Members who are opposed to this bill, but I would urge them to take a long, hard look at the long-range timber needs in America and evaluate the provisions of this legislation to fulfill these needs while protecting our national forests under the concepts of the Multiple-Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it is suggested that this bill provides for no derogation of the time-honored principle of multiple use of our national forests. This claim is made apparently because there are several references to the Multiple Use Act of 1960 in the bill.

There are five basic multiple uses of our national forests: water, recreation, wildlife, forage, and wood. This bill provides an earmarked fund for the sole benefit of only one of these uses; it provides a plain mandate to cut more trees, faster—that is its whole purpose. None of the other public values get this sort of preferential treatment. That is why it is meaningless to state that multiple use principles will really be observed if this bill passes.

This legislation is indeed a land classification measure, and because of this, it seriously affects the jurisdiction of other committees of Congress, especially that of the Interior Committee. It is a land classification measure because it allocates the earmarked funds for timber cutting and management uses on all the lands of our national forests which they now grow or are capable of growing crops of industrial wood.

If these areas happen to provide other public values too, such as water, scenic beauty, wilderness, grazing, or wildlife, that is just too bad. None of these values get the funding that timber does. None of these uses have the mandate from Congress to the Forest Service to apply the earmarked funds to specific acreages as provided for in the bill.

Indeed, proponents of the bill have attempted to deny that it is a land classification bill by stating that, at most, it could apply only to 97 million acres of forest land. That is a lot of land. But not only is it a lot of land—it is also all of the forest land with trees on it. This act gives first priority and first use to the tree-covered lands of our national forests to logging and timber production. That is why it is a land classification land.

Proponents of the legislation have stated that the bill would not hinder the process of reclassification of suitable lands for wilderness and scenic values. But then, at least in some statements I have read, they make the statement that intensified logging in what they call the "more productive lands" will release what they call "marginal lands" for other uses. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that only "marginal lands" which are not good for anything else should be left for wildlife, wilderness, parks, or recreation. But this bill will do just that.

Regardless of what the Forest Service says, this bill harms the multiple use concept. It classifies the tree-covered lands for wood use first; it provides the earmarked funds for this use only; it provides a clear mandate to get in there and increase logging. Many of those so-called "dead and dying" trees that the timber industry wishes to log are in highly scenic areas.

The bill should be returned to committee for further study. The rule should be voted down.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, we are told that these are the "environmental 1970's." Our President, our scientists, and our major media are telling us that we simply have to give consideration to preserving our environment or else face the prospect of suffering for generations.

Today we are faced with a test of our commitment as we consider the rule for H.R. 12025, the National Timber Conservation and Management Act of 1969; for if this bill is passed, our national forests, currently managed by the principle of balanced multiple use, would be converted into sterile tree farms. Wilderness areas would be indiscriminately eliminated; watershed management would become impossible along many vital streams; and recreational values would be completely forgotten.

This bill would bring about these harmful results through the establishment of a trust fund from timber revenue to be used exclusively for the promoting of timber cutting. The establishment of this fund would unbalance the multiple use—outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, and wildlife and fish—mix of values which have governed administration of our national forests since the enactment in 1960 of the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960—16 U.S.C. 522-531.

The establishment of a special fund for timber cutting would in effect give timber sales a large actual priority over the other principles.

It would establish such a priority by segregating 61 percent of the Forest Service's estimated budget for the exclusive use of only one of the five values. The Secretary of Agriculture in a letter to the House Agriculture Committee

said that if funds were earmarked in this manner there could be difficulty in financing the other programs for outdoor recreation, wildlife forage, and water production. He recommended that action on this bill be held in abeyance pending a full review of the national forests.

This bill would also bring about a de facto priority for timber sales by enacting a special financing mechanism which, in effect, is a statement by Congress that as a matter of policy timber production is a favored value.

Finally, this bill would bring about a timber cutting priority by putting enormous pressures on the Forest Service to increase timber production and make it difficult to rationally and impartially consider the claims of increased timber production versus other multiple use values. This is achieved by providing funds to the Forest Service based on the amount cut so that the more that is cut the more money the Forest Service would receive.

The trust fund is not the only harmful feature of the bill. Another is the provision providing that money from the fund could be used for the cutting of timber on all forest land not officially set aside for another purpose. By so doing, this bill would serve to destroy a great deal of virgin wilderness land.

There are areas like those formally designated as wilderness areas which the Sierra Club terms "de facto wilderness areas." These are virgin timber land that has remained roadless. However, since the bill defines all lands not already receiving some official protection as commercial timberlands, these would now be exploited for timber purposes and in fact the Forest Service would be required to do so.

Although theoretically such areas could still be brought under official wilderness designation such a procedure is time-consuming and may well be accomplished too late, if at all, given the pressures to cut which this bill creates.

This provision would thus lead to the destruction of certain areas, whose recreational and other values are more important than the timber which could be harvested from them.

The original impetus for this bill was the sudden rise in the price of lumber in early 1969. The bill rests on the presumption that a principal cause of the price rise was a shortage of timber available for cutting. This presumption is subject to major qualifications which the supporters of the bill conceded.

It was admitted at the hearings on the bill and elsewhere that a number of factors coincided to contribute to the price increases: extended bad weather which impeded logging; a boxcar shortage which prevented supplies from reaching markets; a temporarily low capacity of producers to process timber—attributable to an earlier industrial recession which forced out many smaller producers, increased exports, and other factors.

However, in the past 9 months lumber prices have fallen nearly as far and as fast as they rose. At the end of 1969 the prices were at or near their 1968 levels. As the representative of a central city district, I have been extremely concerned

with the housing crisis faced by this Nation. That crisis is particularly acute among the lower income residents of my district.

But I do not believe this bill will in any way alleviate that crisis. It is not a housing bill. It is simply a legislative windfall for the timber industry.

The housing crisis is a consequence of tragically high-interest rates, antiquated zoning laws and out-of-date construction technology. We should squarely face the causes of the crisis, and not be diverted by red herrings.

I intend to vote against consideration of this bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, at one time or another, every one of my colleagues must have seen a cow going after the greener grass on the other side of the fence. Having eaten all the best grass in her own pasture, she goes over to the fence and puts her head through the wire as far as she can reach, yearning with might and main for a bite of that grass in the next pasture.

The timber industry must be feeling very much like that cow, to judge from the contents of a scurrilous tract recently issued by the American Forest Institute. Although it bears the title "Setting the Record Straight," a casual perusal of this tract suggests that a more accurate title would be "Twisting the Record." I have seldom seen a more valiant attempt to foist on the Nation a bill for the benefit of a single industry, at the expense of public resources. In the brief space of 20 paragraphs, this leaflet contains a rich harvest of strawmen, answers that fail to respond to the charges, deliberate misrepresentations, misleading slogans, half truths, and lipservice, all devoted to convincing Members that H.R. 12025, the so-called National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act, is somehow a conservation bill.

My colleagues are not going to be misled by this leaflet, because they know far more about conservation and environmental affairs than the American Forest Institute does. This institute, of course, is nothing more than window dressing for the logging lobby. It was boldly known as "American Forest Products Industries" until the loggers realized they needed a new image. AFI now maintains a staff of public relations men to give the industry a good front, while the timber barons behind the scenes hack away at the foundations of American forestry.

Members who have been in the House of Representatives as long as I have also have seen something of how the timber industry operates when it wants to get through the fence and go after the green grass on the other side. In the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee we have seen the timber industry fight every major conservation bill that came before us, from the Wilderness Act to the Redwood National Park Act. The industry also cherishes the fond hope of logging in the national parks; as recently as 1966 they were asking Congress to let them into Olympic National Park. No doubt the industry leaders are frustrated by the growing role of the citizen in public land decisions, and by the way Members of Congress are exercising their responsibilities in these matters. To bypass these

annoying obstacles, the industry has concocted its masterpiece, H.R. 12025, a bill designed to increase the annual cut on the national forests, camouflaged behind blue-sky promises that intensified "high-yield" management can make up the difference.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to expose the industry's line for what it is: a smoke-screen for a vast, cut-out-and-get-out scheme for the national forests. As my colleagues know, I have had some experience with national forests, as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the National Forest Reservation Commission, and the Public Land Law Review Commission. At this time I intend to take the AFI leaflet apart paragraph by paragraph, and show how its authors have twisted the facts to suit their own, self-seeking purposes.

The leaflet begins:

H.R. 12025, the National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act, was withdrawn from scheduled debate in the House of Representatives February 5.

This is the only completely factual paragraph in the leaflet.

Among the reasons offered for deferral of debate was that the Congress was confused by the charges leveled against the bill by "conservationist" opponents and by conflicting statements as to the position of the Administration.

The only confusion was that of the bill's supporters when they found that Members were seeing through the industry's specious claims.

Best evidence is that organizations opposed to forest management inflamed their members against earlier versions of the bill and news of the impending vote unleashed a flood of wires and letters based on those versions rather than the thoroughly amended bill voted out by the House Agriculture Committee.

The committee amendments are nothing but lipservice devices, apparently intended to make the measure look like a conservation bill, without altering the basic provisions that make it a despoliation bill. Every citizen who cares about the national forests is rightly inflamed by this audacious assault on a great conservation institution.

The Administration's "low-profile" endorsement failed to surface prior to the scheduled debate and some members received conflicting statements of position from the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget.

Indeed, the administration had expressed no position on the committee bill. It had urged delay pending the report of the President's ad hoc task force on lumber, which is still unavailable.

February 11 both Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin and Secretary of Housing and Urban Development George Romney issued strong statements urging enactment of H.R. 12025. The Hardin statement, addressed to Congressional sponsors, specifically noted that the Bureau of the Budget had cleared the Administration's position.

The administration hastily reversed itself, working hand-in-glove with the timber lobby. Secretary Hardin's announcement was released by the American Forest Institute even before it was available from the Secretary's office, and one of the Secretary's spokesmen was a former AFI

publicist. Furthermore, the administration position was in violation of the Environmental Policy Act, which requires specific data on the environmental impact of proposed legislation.

This pamphlet contains specific misconceptions against the measure as stated by opponents and the facts as they are revealed in the language of the bill itself, in hearing records and official reports.

The industry's so-called facts are largely misrepresentation and deceit, as I will proceed to demonstrate.

MISCONCEPTION

H.R. 12025 is a "raid on the National Forests".

FACT

The National Forests were created by the Organic Act of 1897 to "furnish a continuous supply of timber for the use and necessities of citizens of the United States". H.R. 12025 will provide the funding necessary on an assured basis to conduct the scientific planting, cultivation and harvesting practices necessary to better achieve that purpose.

The industry's only defense against the "raid" charge is to take a quotation out of context, completely distorting the import of the Organic Act of 1897. The pertinent language reads, in full:

No national forest shall be established, except to improve and protect the forest within the boundaries, or for the purpose of securing favorable conditions of water flow, and to furnish a continuous supply of timber for the use and necessities of citizens of the United States.

As anyone can see, improving and protecting the forest and providing water are uses coequal with timber. H.R. 12025 is in essence a cut-now-and-grow-later plan, involving accelerated logging on the flimsy assumption that new management techniques would replace the trees later. The bill provides no new funds; Congress already can make needed appropriations for the purpose, and would follow the same procedure under this bill.

MISCONCEPTION

H.R. 12025 ignores the principle of multiple use of the National Forests.

FACT

H.R. 12025 includes specific citation of the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960 in three different places, and charges the Secretary of Agriculture with conducting the programs of the new Act subject to that earlier Act. The House Agriculture Committee report on the bill devotes one full page to Congressional intent with respect to multiple use and states "there is no intent or purpose in this legislation to repeal any of the several statutes affecting national forest resource management."

The authors have demolished a strawman. The industry has not ignored multiple use, but purposely abrogated it. The references to multiple use in the bill are nothing but paper promises, impossible to carry out in the face of the bill's central thrust, which enthrones timber production as the dominant use. I frankly cannot understand why the authors limited themselves to only three citations of the Multiple Use Act of 1960; 10 or 20 might have been more convincing, but equally ineffectual in maintaining multiple use as a viable policy on the national forests.

MISCONCEPTION

H.R. 12025 will classify some 97 million acres of National Forest land as "commercial forest land."

FACT

The bill is not a land classification measure. At the most it could enable intensive forest management on 97 million acres, or about half of the 186 million acres administered by the Forest Service under multiple use. About one-quarter of this 97 million acres is already used for scenic strips, recreation, and other reserved purposes and would be exempt from intensive timber growing treatment.

AFI is purposely evading one of the major impacts of the bill. In every survey of the Nation's timber resources, the Forest Service has responded to pressure from industry by reclassifying more watershed forest as commercial forest land. The area so classified has risen from 73 million acres in 1945 to 92 million in 1963 in the contiguous 48 States, and 97 million including Alaska. The 20 million acres reclassified as commercial are chiefly high-elevation timber lands, on unstable soils, forest that is primarily important for watershed, land stocked with marginal species, and lands with very low growth capacity. These were formerly managed for watershed and recreation values. Most land suitable for addition to the wilderness areas is in this 20 million acres. H.R. 12025, however, requires intensive management on the entire 97 million acres, starting with accelerated logging.

MISCONCEPTION

H.R. 12025 would "foreclose possibility of additions to the National Wilderness Preservation System wherever the qualified area has even the potential for growing marketable wood."

FACT

Present statutory policy and procedures regarding potential wilderness areas remain wholly unaffected by the new Act. The House Agriculture Committee Report on the bill says "Some have expressed concern that H.R. 12025 would endanger those portions of the national forests suitable for wilderness designation. The Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act, to which H.R. 12025 would be subject, provides that establishment and maintenance of areas of wilderness are consistent with its purpose. It is the understanding and expectation of the committee that H.R. 12025 shall not interfere with existing procedures for the designation of wilderness prescribed by the Wilderness Act, or with the present practices for multiple-use management of the national forests under the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act."

Both the AFI leaflet and the language of the committee report reflect none of the Interior Committee's experience with wilderness designation. Many of the best potential wilderness lands involve "commercial forest" land that would be affected by H.R. 12025 and that lacks any protective status whatever to save it from the saw. Once logged, these last virgin lands cannot be added to the wilderness system. Such tracts are found in many national forests, from Alaska and the Pacific Northwest all the way to the Appalachians. The Interior Committee will consider these in due time for addition to the national wilderness preservation system. However, H.R. 12025 would foreclose the Congress's opportunity to protect these last precious wildlands even before we can learn where to look for them. The loggers know where they are, and are ready to move in, as soon as the annual cut is increased.

MISCONCEPTION

The Forest Service already has authority to practice good forestry, and this bill produces no new revenue.

FACT

Inadequate funding has limited Forest Service application of silviculture, H.R. 12025 would provide such funding for long-term forest management improvement. At present, 65 percent of the funds earned annually from National Forest timber sales go directly to the Miscellaneous Receipts of the National Treasury; the remainder are allocated by statute. Thus, the Forest Service, a revenue producing agency of government, derives little benefit from its earnings and is unable to reinvest any substantial return from its earnings in growing new timber. Realization of the potential increase in timber growing on National Forests as stimulated by H.R. 12025 would return substantial additional benefits to the United States not only in dollars earned through sound forest management but in fulfillment of national housing, environmental, and recreational goals.

The industry's interest in funding silviculture arose only with the concoction of H.R. 12025. Where were the timber lobbyists when the Appropriations Committee took up the Forest Service budget last year? I will tell my colleagues where they were not: they did not appear before the Appropriations Committee. The people who were at those hearings asking for silviculture money for the Forest Service are the same people who are opposing H.R. 12025—the conservationists. The money is in the Treasury. All we have to do is appropriate it. None of the elaborate verbiage of H.R. 12025 is going to produce a dime that we do not already have.

Actually, it is not financing the industry wants; that is simply a transparent excuse. What they really want are the provisions in section 7, to shorten rotations and increase the cut now in old-growth timber, in amounts rationalized to the maximum by application of high-yield measures. That would make a mockery of multiple use and turn the national forests into cheap tree farms, at the expense of every conceivable national goal.

MISCONCEPTION

Old growth timber will be sawed down as fast as modern machinery can do the job.

FACT

The Act charges the Secretary of Agriculture, subject to the provisions of the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960, to "revise the allowable annual harvesting rates in national forests to take into account (a) rotation ages estimated to be appropriate for markets and technology at the expected time of harvest, (b) the need for and benefits from use of high level current harvest rate options available within sustained yield limitations, and (c) increase timber yields which will result from application of the measures authorized by section 6 of this Act, as rapidly as possible after such measures have been undertaken: Provided, that appropriate reduction in allowable harvesting rates will be made if planned measures are not satisfactorily accomplished;" (emphasis furnished). Harvesting cycles would be adjusted as growth rates are determined. Faster growing trees can be harvested at an earlier age. The Forest Service will continue to determine harvesting cycles.

AFI's so-called fact completely fails to refute the charge. H.R. 12025's provisions to increase the annual cut mean simply that the old growth will be logged

off faster than is now projected. That, of course, is where the industry's interest lies, since the big trees, hundreds of years old, mean more profit. The provision to reduce the cutting rate is mere lipservice, since the trees will already have been cut and taken off to market. The only result would be a shortage during the ensuing years.

MISCONCEPTION

The current export of timber, over 4 billion board feet a year to Japan alone, makes absurd the claim that the United States faces a massive timber shortage.

FACT

The U.S. is a net importer of lumber. Over six billion board feet of finished lumber products were imported last year, primarily from Canada. In 1969, the U.S. exported about two billion board feet of logs, mostly to Japan, and about one billion board feet of lumber. Export curtailment would simply impose new foreign demands on Canada, thus limiting our own supplies derived through imports.

AFI is making a deliberate misrepresentation of the facts. Our Canadian imports would not be curtailed by Japanese bidding, because our imports are in the form of lumber. Canada prohibits exports of logs, which is all the Japanese are buying.

MISCONCEPTION

Substitute materials will meet our national housing needs.

FACT

Substitute materials may achieve certain traditional wood markets in home construction, but may not achieve either the volumes or economies of wood. Most wood substitutes—steel, aluminum, plastics—involve depletable raw materials. Wood does not.

Much as the loggers would like to forget it, substitutes for wood are increasingly being used in housing. Substitute materials are not only economically competitive and long lasting, but many of them will be capable of being recycled by new materials technology in the years ahead. So, although lumbermen may cling to the antiquated jargon of "renewable versus nonrenewable resources," the reality already is very different than the words imply. Some timber companies, recognizing this, even now are entering the substitute materials market. The Weyerhaeuser Co., for example, recently reported to its shareholders:

The company's new Shelter Group will not operate as a primary sales outlet for the firm's wood building materials. As a development and construction business, it will serve the shelter market and will use competitive materials when they provide the best market or economic answer.

The Boise-Cascade Corp., likewise is branching out into substitute materials.

MISCONCEPTION

The intent of H.R. 12025 is to construct roads through now roadless forest areas.

FACT

The provision in H.R. 12025 authorizing use of these funds for road construction in advance of planned harvest was deleted by the Agriculture Committee before the bill was reported. The high timber yield fund will be used for increasing timber yield on national forest commercial timber areas.

AFI is indulging in more lipservice. Deletting the language about roads is one thing; eliminating the roads themselves is another. AFI does not explain how all

the logging and pruning and thinning are going to be done without roads, and in any case, section 6(8) provides ample authority for roadbuilding by authorizing "such other timber production improvement practices as the Secretary of Agriculture deems appropriate." There is no doubt that roads are going to be built under this bill. As my colleagues will note, even the AFI leaflet avoids any clear statement that would disprove the charge cited above.

MISCONCEPTION

The Multiple Use program will be thrown out of balance by overfunding timber management and ignoring the rest of the National Forest program.

FACT

"The rest of the National Forest Program" has been funded at a higher proportionate level than timber growing. H.R. 12025 will allow forest resource productivity to respond to the nation's housing needs.

The level of funding will continue to be controlled by the Appropriations Committee and the Congress. Activities under the bill such as thinning, pruning and prompt regeneration will enhance outdoor recreation activities, wildlife habitat and water management.

The bill strikes at the heart of the multiple use policy, not only by biasing the appropriations process in favor of timber, but by allowing an immediate overcut of standing timber, regardless of conflicts with other resource uses, and regardless of the unproven nature of the proposed forestry techniques.

AFI's claim that thinning and pruning will enhance other values of the forest is typical of an industry which sees a clearcut forest, stripped of its trees, as a "thing of beauty—a viewpoint not shared either by the public or by the recreation users of the national forests, who are unanimously opposed to this bill.

MISCONCEPTION

Our National Forests will be sacrificed in the name of short-term economic benefits.

FACT

Short-term economic benefits are irrelevant to the purpose of this timber-growing bill. There are no such things as "instant trees". The U.S. will require sufficient wood fiber for many needs forever. Growing those supplies requires action now—not continued neglect. The many industrial forest owners are conducting aggressive high yield programs on their own lands to increase timber growing. Forestry groups are seeking ways to apply these proven techniques to other private lands, in cooperation with the Forest Service. H.R. 12025 will accelerate forestry on all forest lands, public and private.

This is simply a bluff, but it cannot mislead Members familiar with the industry's tactics. If this is really a timber-growing bill, why does it include an increase in the annual cut? Inevitably, when the timber industry has claimed to be acting in the long-range public interest, whether it is asking us to let them log the rain forests of Olympic Park or urging us to forget about putting any trees into the wilderness system, the end result would be more logging, now. H.R. 12025 continues this pattern of consistent misrepresentation, attempting to conceal the bill's immediate impact behind the glib depiction of a rosy future. In fact, however, the future is far from

certain, because from the short period of time the so-called high-yield forestry has been in use, it is impossible to predict the results 60 to 100 years hence, when the trees will be mature. The industry is asking us to count the chickens before they are hatched.

The leaflet makes the absurd claim that H.R. 12025 would accelerate forestry on private lands, when its actual effect would be just the opposite. If my colleagues seek the basis for AFI's claim in the bill itself, they will find one single reference to private lands in section 7(3) (B), which calls for "a program for the development of all the Nation's commercial forest lands for high sustained timber yield." No such program is embodied in H.R. 12025, for the simple reason that the industry wants no Federal intervention in its cut-out-and-get-out logging operations. Just such a Federal program was proposed by the Secretary of Agriculture in 1933, entitled the "National Plan for American Forestry," but it was defeated by pressure from the same industry that now purports to be a bulwark of good forestry.

It would take no time at all to add provisions to H.R. 12025 calling for regulation of private forestry. But if we ask the industry spokesmen to support such an amendment we find that they want no Forest Service men looking into their logging. For some reason, the timber industry seems to fear public scrutiny of the same "high-yield forestry" its spokesmen are so vigorous in advocating for the national forests.

In reality, H.R. 12025 would discourage private forestry by flooding the market with western timber, thereby removing the economic incentives for efficient, long-range forestry on private lands.

MISCONCEPTION

The Nixon Administration agrees with conservationists that action on H.R. 12025 would be premature.

FACT

The Secretary of Agriculture stated February 11: "We are strongly of the opinion that this legislation will promote greatly improved forest management practices and is essential to improving the timber producing capacity of the National Forests within multiple use and sustained yield principles."

"H.R. 12025 as reported has the complete approval of this Department and we recommend that it be enacted."

"The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program."

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development told the press that same day: "In the next five years, domestic timber requirements for use in residential construction alone will almost double."

"Without the substantial increase in timber production which the enactment of this legislation will encourage, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to build the homes America needs."

The administration did indeed recommend delay until the President's ad hoc task force on lumber had submitted its report. However, since February 5, when H.R. 12025 was withdrawn from the floor program, we have witnessed the disgraceful performance of two Cabinet Secretaries dancing to the industry's tune, in flagrant disregard of the Environmental Policy Act signed into law only 7 weeks

ago. In their haste to bail the industry out of a leaky ship, the Secretaries had to resort to glib, unsupported generalities that completely evade the real issues at stake in this debate. They failed to report on the specific environmental effects of the bill—which are hardly escapable—and they did not deign to submit themselves to questioning in any hearing on the bill. It may be easy for the gentlemen downtown to evade the blame for a raid on the national forests, as contemplated by this bill. But in this body, we take our environmental responsibilities more seriously.

The leaflet then concludes with a summation of the foregoing misrepresentations.

Mr. Speaker, I have found no pleasure in making this lengthy exposition of the deceptions being perpetrated by the industry that is behind this legislation. Yet I felt it necessary to do so in detail, going to the roots of the issue, so it would be crystal clear what this bill implies: a well-camouflaged attack on the national forests. When this is clear, we can join to reject H.R. 12025 and, with the slate clean, we can proceed to develop legislation that will promote good forestry throughout our forest lands, protecting our public and private forests instead of promoting their demise.

I pledge myself to this effort, and I invite my colleagues to join me. The first step is to reject H.R. 12025.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the conservation challenge of the seventies requires that we seek a reasonable balance between the demands of our technology and the preservation of our environment. Just as we cannot sacrifice our resources to an unbridled economic growth, neither can we ignore the demands of over 200 million Americans for food, housing, and recreation.

The public lands policy of this country, as expressed in the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960 recognizes the necessity of preserving this balance. The bill before us today, the National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act, is an extension of that principle.

Briefly, this bill would establish a fund for the financing of sound timber growing practices in the management of our national forests subject to the terms of the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act. I submit that those who charge that the bill sacrifices our national forests to maximum timber cutting without regard for protection of watershed, fish and wildlife, grazing, scenic and recreation values are misled with regard to the content of this measure.

This bill does not compromise the multiple use and sustained yield principles under which the national forests are managed. Nor does it give priority to timber development over water, wildlife, or recreation. It does provide for the application of improved management practices under sound conservation practices to increase the timber yield from our national forests.

As a purely practical matter, some may have overlooked the fact that the application of sound sustained-yield management practices in our forests will have an effect similar to that which modern

agricultural practices had upon our farmlands; namely, that we will be able to produce more timber than we do today on much less land.

Equally as important—and as practical—is the fact that this bill will help to ease the critical shortage and cost of housing confronting Americans of middle and low incomes.

Mr. Speaker, there are over 11.5 million acres in national forests and other lands being administered by the Forest Service in the State of Arizona. I would not want to take any action that would jeopardize these forests for future generations of Americans and feel that this bill would certainly do nothing of the kind.

Our President has properly indicated that one of the most important issues confronting Americans in this decade is the quality of our environment. I share that sentiment and trust that this fine ideal will not be the basis upon which a sound and balanced piece of legislation is discarded.

I urge the enactment of H.R. 12025.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my opposition to H.R. 12025, the National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act.

This bill would establish a new high timber yield fund, into which would be funneled all Federal timber sales revenues not already obligated or earmarked, for a program of intensified logging of our national forests. It purports to meet the need for increased housing to rehabilitate our cities by alleviating an alleged timber shortage.

Mr. Speaker, I have yet to be shown any persuasive evidence of such a shortage. An industry which boasts export totals of 4 billion board feet, the most recent annual figure available, as compared to the yearly 12 billion board feet cut in our national forests, does not appear to be in great difficulty.

In fact, the committee report on H.R. 12025 speaks to the national need for 2.6 million housing units per year for the next decade, a goal with which I am in complete accord, and while I am appreciative of the committee's concern, it seems obvious that our problem is more closely related to the prevailing high interest rates which as always have caused housing starts to fall off because of the unavailability of mortgage money. The President has requested funds for only 600,000 federally assisted low- and moderate-income housing units in his fiscal 1971 budget, and without a stronger commitment from the executive branch, I fail to see how we can even approach the goal of 2.6 million units in the coming year.

In point of fact, Mr. Speaker, this legislation has been urged upon us by the timber industry because of sharp increases in lumber and plywood prices in 1968 and early 1969, prices which have since receded to earlier levels. With the annual cut on our national forests accelerating from 5 billion board feet in 1950 to 12 billion currently, serious questions arise about the advisability of sanctioning further increases of cutting in forests where the sustained yield principle has served our needs well for many decades. Evidence of overcutting in disregard of sound forestry principles is

pointed out in the Forest Service's own admission that it has a 4.8 million acre backlog of reforestation and a 13 million acre backlog in thinning and other improvement work in young timber stands. Such figures do not lend credence to a program designed to sharply accelerate the harvesting of timber in the national forests.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, a massive diversion of timber revenues into a new high yield fund at a time of severe budgetary and inflation problems will almost certainly create pressures for cutbacks in U.S. Forest Service outlays in other important activities—watershed protection, wildlife habitat, range, and recreation.

The multiple-use concept as approved by the Congress explicitly requires the Forest Service to avoid putting disproportionate emphasis on any one of its many necessary functions, yet here we have legislation proposing to channel all unobligated receipts, probably in the neighborhood of 60 percent of the budget, into timber harvesting alone.

And while the bill purports not to affect wilderness areas, its provisions for increased logging extend to any "forest land which is producing or is capable of producing crops of industrial wood and not withdrawn from timber utilization by statute or administrative regulation." That phrase clearly exempts presently designated wilderness areas, but no reassurances are contained therein for conservation of virgin forests which are under consideration now or may be nominated in the future for inclusion in the wilderness system. A forest does not regenerate itself in a year's time nor in a decade, but is a product of centuries. In allowing intensive harvesting on any unprotected area we run the risk of losing forever a precious natural resource which, once lost, can never be regained. There will be no second chance for any of our great wilderness areas of the future if they are violated today.

Mr. Speaker, we are not here dealing with the depletion of natural resources that can be rehabilitated quickly, if ever at all. At the same time that I would be among the first to urge a deeper commitment to the critical housing needs facing the Nation today, I am not convinced that this proposed timber supply act will have any salutary effect whatsoever. Until we have such evidence, as well as coordinated national commitment to move ahead on the housing front, I urge that we withhold our approval from this measure which threatens established conservation principles without demonstrable benefit to the public in compensation.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, supporters of the National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act, which we are today considering, have said that this bill will provide more timber for commercial use while at the same time applying sound conservation principles to our public forests. These same groups further claim that this measure will assist in remedying the present shortage of new housing.

I disagree. Let us examine these statements more closely.

This bill would apply high yield for-

estry techniques on a large scale to national forest timberlands. Included in these techniques are fertilization, thinning, pruning, monoculture of a single species and reforestation; extensive access-road building is also included in this concept. It provides that more wood, in the form of smaller trees, will be available for cutting. But smaller trees have a vastly impairing effect upon surrounding areas. Stunted growth, yellow needles, increasing disease, soil erosion and deterioration, and failure of reproduction ensue. We are learning slowly, and belatedly, the ecological imbalances that result when we tamper with nature's techniques. A depletion in natural resources should not be a national goal.

Further, this legislation will make it almost impossible to afford protection to outstanding scenic and wilderness areas of the national forests if they have trees. It undercuts the avowed purpose of Congress to provide acreage for future public use untrammelled by society's technological advances.

With respect to the question of housing needs, the Agriculture Committee has not shown that the United States consumed any more volume of wood than it did 50 years ago, despite of the doubling in the Nation's population and a fivefold increase in the GNP. The decrease in new housing is not due to the shortage of wood, but the soaring costs of all related materials, coupled with high interest rates and tight money.

It takes several lifetimes to grow a tree. The destruction to forest lands that might ensue as a result of this legislation far exceeds any possible short-range benefits.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, the timber supply and conservation bill, H.R. 12025, is before us today, and many are asking what effect the bill will have on national forest management if and when it is passed.

I may be able to furnish some guidelines. In my own district can be found three national forests, two national parks, two wilderness areas, one national recreation area, and one national historical park. This gives me a pretty good idea of how Federal lands are managed.

The U.S. Forest Service will have jurisdiction over H.R. 12025. They support the bill. So does the National Urban League and other groups.

Pressured by conservationists and by the timber industry, the Forest Service sometimes appears to be the object of that old childhood game, "King of the Mountain." My intentions are superior to yours, the antagonists seems to be saying.

The Forest Service thus becomes something of a judge. It is also a master planner. All national forest policies result largely from the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960. To carry out its obligations under the law, the Forest Service has devised a series of highly complicated management plans. It is like zoning.

For example, in the early 1960's, the Service reclassified about a dozen areas in the North Cascades, and the effect was to ban or restrict severely any timber-

cutting programs. The wood products industry was not happy.

On the other hand, the Forest Service has allowed timber sales and has permitted roadbuilding in areas that displeased conservationists.

The point of all this is that the men of the U.S. Forest Service cannot satisfy all land users all the time. We have a limited resource base which must, by law, be used in several fashions. As a result, neither the timber industry nor the conservationists can get the Forest Service to do exactly what they would like.

I, too, have had disputes with Forest Service policy, particularly over the matter of log exports. Yet, the Service attempts to do the best job of managing resources as they see it. Most of the employees are skilled professionals, many of them graduates of the great forestry schools such as the University of Washington.

The Forest Service is sensitive to the issue of de facto wilderness areas. They created the 458,000 acre Glacier Peak Wilderness Area in my district in 1960 and have recommended several new areas in the Snoqualmie and Gifford Pinchot National Forests.

They have not allowed the annual timber cuts to go beyond what they felt was necessary and proper. During the fall 1969 meeting of the Western Wood Products Association in Portland, Oreg., Chief Ed Cliff was criticized by certain industry leaders who felt that his Service was top-heavy with "preservationists."

H.R. 12025 AND MULTIPLE USE

H.R. 12025 conforms directly with the Multiple Use Act of 1960. The original version of the bill did not, and perhaps this has caused some confusion.

At that same meeting of the Western Wood Products Association, Chief Cliff was asked to estimate future timber harvesting schedules.

By 1973, responded Chief Cliff, we might be able to increase the annual allowable cut on national forest lands from the current 13.4 billion board feet to 19.1 billion board feet. This estimate assumes that the Forest Service will have all the funds it needs and that no further land withdrawals will be taken.

The total inventory of softwood timber on the 52 percent of national forest lands classified as "commercial" is 1,064 billion board feet.

H.R. 12025 is a funding measure. Multiple use requirements will still govern forestry management.

Why this legislation is needed can be demonstrated by the Mount Baker National Forest. Flying over it, you can look down and observe thousands of acres cut over but not reforested because funds are lacking. In fact, Chief Cliff estimates that there is a total U.S. backlog of 4.8 million acres needing replanting.

In summation, the public lands must respond to the public needs, be they for hiking, fishing, or housing. They are public property belonging to the conservationist and to the ghetto child now trapped in the squalor and shame of wretched housing.

Environment, Mr. Speaker, is more

than undisturbed landscapes. Environment is that which surrounds our lives. A life that enjoys solitude among nature is no more superior than a life that wants a better place to live.

No, H.R. 12025 will not sanction a "mow 'em down" logging policy. We locked that concept away long ago.

This is a reasonable bill. It furnishes industry-supplied receipts so that the U.S. Forest Service can embark on a necessary program of higher timber yields consistent with sound principles of multiple use.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I had originally expected to support H.R. 12025, a bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial forest land, to establish a high timber yield fund, and for other purposes.

I support this concept because I believe that the National Forest Service should and must apply to the management of national forests the same principles of good forestry practices which nearly every private timber company now uses or is beginning to use. I hope that in the very near future that the National Forest Service will take a few lessons from, and a few pages out of the book, from the sound forest conservation, growth and harvesting of timber which companies like International Paper, Union-Camp Paper, Weyerhaeuser, the Langdale Co., and other timber companies are now using in their own timber holdings.

On page 6 of H.R. 12025, as amended, there appears the following language: "that increased annual harvests from national forest commercial forest land may be permitted under sound conservation principles on the basis of short-range accomplishments so long as long-range goals are assured."

Mr. Speaker, this language empowers the Secretary of Agriculture, and grants to the Secretary of Agriculture, the power to make an administrative determination that he can cut every single tree in every national forest in the United States in 1 year, if he wants to. From which administrative determination there is no appeal.

I have such confidence in the present Secretary of Agriculture that I know that he would never make such a determination but I do not want him or any future Secretary of Agriculture to have that much authority. No good man would want such authority and no bad man should have it.

Mr. Speaker, the primary rule which must be applied to any legislation is: "Do not vote for any bill based on what a good man could do with the authority such bill grants; base your decision to vote for or against it based on what a bad man with evil motives could do with unlimited grants of power and unrestricted authority."

All too often bad legislation comes to the House wrapped in a pretty package and bearing an attractive label. Frequently such legislation is enacted and we are today witnessing the tragic results of several pieces of such legislation and several such Supreme Court decisions.

Mr. Speaker, in the coarse vernacular, bad legislation bearing an attractive label can be compared to a beautifully wrapped Christmas package containing ashes, or even worse the remains of a dead rat.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a number of telegrams identically worded and purportedly bearing the signatures of residents of Georgia some of whom reside in the Sixth District of Georgia and are well known to me. Ordinarily I would have accepted these telegrams and would have acknowledged them giving full faith and credit to each, but a similar set of circumstances occurred earlier this month. When the early series of telegrams were delivered, I read and promptly acknowledged each. Much to my surprise, three of the persons to whom I acknowledged such telegrams wrote or telephoned me conveying the same message. I quote from one of these letters:

DEAR JACK: Thank you for your acknowledgement of a telegram urging you to vote to override the President's veto of the HEW appropriation bill.

You are correct in assuming that I would have voted exactly as you did on the issue. The reason I am writing is to find out how my name got on a telegram which I did not send, sign, authorize or approve of!

Tell me how I can find out who might have used my name without my permission.

Thank you for your continued interest in seeing that your constituents are informed of your feelings on these important issues.

Very truly yours,

(Name deleted).

Note that I have deleted the name of the gentleman who signed this letter because, while he is a friend and cherished constituent, I have not had time to obtain his prior consent before including his name in my remarks.

When I received his letter quoted I inquired and learned the name of the person who actually sent such telegrams and paid the charges for the same. It taught me a lesson: From now on, whenever I receive a telegram, the text of which is contrary to what I have reason to believe is the thinking and philosophy of the purported sender, I am going to ask such purported sender whether he actually sent such a telegram.

Today I received a number of telegrams identically worded asking me to support H.R. 12025. Immediate inquiry revealed that these telegrams did not even originate in the Sixth District of Georgia, although they bore the name and address of residents of the Sixth District of Georgia. Each originated more than 100 miles outside of the Sixth District of Georgia, and the contents and the fact that such telegrams had been sent were unknown to some of the persons whose purported signatures appeared thereon.

I welcome, encourage and invite comments from all constituents and from personal friends who may not be constituents. Expressions of all views on legislation is welcomed by me through every method of communication my constituents and friends may choose to use. It matters not whether such expressions come in the form of personal conferences, telephone calls, telegrams, or

typed or hand-written letters. I welcome them all.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do not welcome any message sent by any person without the prior knowledge and consent of the person whose purported signature appears.

Mr. Speaker, although my mind was open on merits of H.R. 12025, I had planned to vote for the rule, House Resolution 799 which upon the adoption of such resolution would have made in order the consideration of the bill H.R. 12025.

The receipt of unauthorized telegrams caused me to read the bill and the report, section by section and word by word to see what it contained that would cause anybody to send out unauthorized telegrams to influence my decision. Upon careful study and my analysis of what the bill actually contains, I have concluded that this is bad legislation which I shall vote against in its present form and pending that will vote against the rule. If the rule is defeated it will enable the Committee on Agriculture to revise the language of the bill to accomplish the objectives which I know many of the sponsors and supporters of this legislation have in mind. It could be a good bill, but H.R. 12025 in its present form is not. I hope the rule will be defeated.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I shall depart from my ordinary course and vote against the rule on H.R. 12025 which has been described as the national timber supply bill.

To oppose a rule is a course I have followed very infrequently because I believe that ordinarily a Member should listen to debate on a bill before reaching a conclusion. The only exceptions should be in those cases in which a bill is so very bad the time of the House should not be taken to debate it or in those rare instances in which it becomes apparent in advance that the only vote a Member will have to express his position on the measure will be a vote on the rule. The latter situation would seem to obtain today as to H.R. 12025.

While there are salient points which would have been considered in Committee of the Whole—I was impressed from the mail I received from the conservationists who are sincerely concerned that much of our timber shortage is not due to lack of production but to the heavy exports to other countries. I was also impressed that little or nothing has been done to seek timber substitutes in the building trades.

If my mail is accurate there prevails a belief that timber prices have subsided to the level before their increase in 1968. I also had reason to believe the contention was accurate that forestry ecology would be adversely affected by the intensive forestry practices of the bill.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I was persuaded to oppose this rule because the chairman of the Insular and Interior Affairs Committee assures me that committee does not at this time have a bill which will overcome the objections conservationists.

The Public Land Law Review Commission, chaired by Congressman ASPINALL, an 18-member Commission, consists of

six Representatives, six Senators and six public members appointed by the President. They have been studying all the aspects of public land management including lumber production, grazing, and mining rights. The Commission will report to the President on June 30 and one of its major recommendations will be in the area of timber management on public land including national forests.

All of the arguments of those who favor this bill should be presented to the Commission. We should not consider H.R. 12025 today, but wait until after June 30 for further consideration of our timber supply problems.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the President have recently declared themselves advocates of environmental quality, and this phrase, "environmental quality," is tossed around freely and widely praised by people from the whole political spectrum.

But talking about it, and doing something about it are two different matters. Today we have an opportunity to act positively by defeating a bill that would be detrimental to the quality of our environment by mandating a raid on our national forests.

And, do not be mistaken—our national forests do contribute to a decent life not only by providing timber, but just as important by providing recreational facilities, habitat for wildlife, vital watershed, and a place where our harried fellow citizens can still get away from it all.

In 1968, Forest Service recreation areas had 157 million visitor-days use by our citizens, and with careful development of facilities, the forests have the capacity to accommodate many more visitors. If you have ever visited Yellowstone National Park in the summer, you know that we do need more recreation areas for our people. Some of our parks are turning into slums because so many people are flocking to them, and at the rate our population is growing it is obvious that we will need to provide more areas where families can escape the cities and see tall trees, a sparkling clear stream, and native wildlife. We already have a legacy of such potential recreation land within our national forests, but it is obvious that if we require intensive timber cutting in these areas their value for recreation will be diminished or destroyed for many years. I cannot imagine anyone enjoying a visit to a mountainside that has been clear cut and looks like a tornado had been through it.

More intensive logging will mean more extensive erosion of soil which will degrade the future productivity of the land. It will also increase siltation in streams. We are all aware of the clean water crisis, and it behooves us to protect what few pure streams and rivers we have left. Intensive forestry will also mean an increase in pesticides and insecticides, which will degrade the watershed.

For 200 years we have plundered our natural resources. Have we learned nothing from experience? Or are we going to continue to consume them without thought of the future. Forests are a renewable resource, but nature does not operate like an assembly line. We can not expect forests that are intensively cut to replenish themselves overnight.

Proponents of the bill proclaim it is necessary because of a housing shortage. The country is still growing timber at a rate faster than it is being cut. The pending legislation would, in effect, authorize a heavier cutting at a time when our national forests need substantial rehabilitation. In order to achieve a balanced policy I feel that the Congress should await the release of the President's task force on housing and timber needs before rushing headlong into passing this bill.

The national forests are part of our national heritage, and this treasure should be protected and nurtured. I urge you to vote against this piece of legislation.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. SISK. 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 150, nays 229, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—150

Abbott	Gettys	Myers
Abner	Gibbons	Natcher
Albert	Goodling	Nix
Alexander	Green, Ore.	O'Konski
Anderson, Ill.	Griffin	O'Neal, Ga.
Andrews, Ala.	Gubser	Pasman
Annuizio	Gude	Patman
Arends	Hammer-	Pickle
Ashley	schmidt	Pirnie
Barrett	Hansen, Idaho	Pollock
Beall, Md.	Hansen, Wash.	Price, Tex.
Belcher	Harvey	Pryor, Ark.
Betts	Hathaway	Purcell
Blackburn	Hébert	Quillen
Blanton	Henderson	Reifel
Bow	Hicks	Rhodes
Brinkley	Hollfield	Rivers
Brown, Mich.	Hosmer	Rostenkowski
Brown, Ohio	Hull	Ruppe
Broyhill, N.C.	Hutchinson	Scott
Broyhill, Va.	Ichord	Sebelius
Buchanan	Jarman	Shriver
Burleson, Tex.	Johnson, Calif.	Sikes
Burlison, Mo.	Jonas	Sisk
Burton, Utah	Jones, Tenn.	Smith, Iowa
Carter	Kuykendall	Smith, N.Y.
Casey	Landgrebe	Steiger, Ariz.
Chamberlain	Landrum	Steiger, Wis.
Clausen,	Lloyd	Stephens
Don H.	Long, La.	Stubblefield
Collins	McClure	Stuckey
Colmer	McCulloch	Talcott
Corman	McFall	Teague, Tex.
Cowger	McKneally	Thompson, Ga.
Cunningham	McMillan	Thomson, Wis.
Davis, Ga.	MacGregor	Ullman
Davis, Wis.	Mahon	Utt
Dellenback	Mann	Vander Jagt
Dorn	Martin	Waggonner
Dowdy	Mathias	Wampler
Edmondson	May	Whalen
Edwards, Ala.	Mayne	Whitten
Erlenborn	Meeds	Widnall
Flowers	Meskill	Wiggins
Foley	Michel	Williams
Ford, Gerald R.	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Bob
Foreman	Miller, Ohio	Winn
Fountain	Mills	Wold
Fulton, Tenn.	Mize	Wyatt
Fuqua	Mizell	Young
Garmatz	Montgomery	

NAYS—229

Adair	Fisher	Nichols
Adams	Flood	Obey
Addabbo	Flynt	O'Hara
Anderson,	Ford,	Olsen
Calif.	William D.	O'Neill, Mass.
Andrews,	Fraser	Patten
N. Dak.	Frelinghuysen	Pelly
Ashbrook	Friedel	Perkins
Aspinall	Fulton, Pa.	Philbin
Ayres	Galifianakis	Pike
Bell, Calif.	Gallagher	Poage
Bennett	Gaydos	Podell
Bevill	Gialmo	Poff
Blaggi	Gilbert	Preyer, N.C.
Blester	Goldwater	Price, Ill.
Bingham	Gonzalez	Pucinski
Blatnik	Gray	Quile
Boggs	Griffiths	Railsback
Boland	Gross	Randall
Bolling	Grover	Rees
Brademas	Haley	Reid, Ill.
Brasco	Hall	Reid, N.Y.
Bray	Halpern	Reuss
Broomfield	Hamilton	Roberts
Brotzman	Hanley	Robison
Burke, Fla.	Hanna	Rodino
Burke, Mass.	Harrington	Roe
Burton, Calif.	Harsha	Rogers, Colo.
Bush	Hawkins	Rogers, Fla.
Button	Hechler, W. Va.	Rooney, N.Y.
Byrne, Pa.	Heckler, Mass.	Rooney, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.	Helstoski	Roth
Cabell	Hogan	Roudebush
Caffery	Horton	Roybal
Carey	Howard	Ryan
Celler	Hungate	St. Onge
Chappell	Hunt	Sandman
Clancy	Jacobs	Satterfield
Clark	Johnson, Pa.	Saylor
Clawson, Del.	Jones, Ala.	Schadeberg
Clay	Karh	Schneebeli
Cleveland	Kastenmeier	Scheuer
Cohelan	Kazen	Schwengel
Collier	Kee	Shipley
Conable	Keith	Skubitz
Conte	King	Slack
Conyers	Kleppe	Smith, Calif.
Corbett	Kluczynski	Snyder
Coughlin	Koch	Springer
Cramer	Kyl	Staggers
Crane	Kyros	Stanton
Culver	Long, Md.	Steed
Daddario	Lowenstein	Stokes
Daniel, Va.	Lujan	Sullivan
Daniels, N.J.	McCarthy	Taylor
de la Garza	McClory	Tierman
Delaney	McCloskey	Udall
Dent	McDade	Van Deerlin
Derwinski	Macdonald,	Vanik
Devine	Mass.	Vigorito
Dingell	Madden	Waldie
Donohue	Mailliard	Watkins
Downing	Marsh	Watts
Dulski	Matsunaga	Weicker
Duncan	Melcher	Whalley
Dwyer	Minish	White
Eckhardt	Mink	Wilson,
Edwards, Calif.	Minshall	Charles H.
Ellberg	Mollohan	Wolf
Eshleman	Monagan	Wright
Evans, Colo.	Moorhead	Wyder
Eyins, Tenn.	Morgan	Wylie
Fallon	Morse	Wyman
Farbstein	Mosher	Yates
Fascell	Murphy, Ill.	Yatron
Feighan	Murphy, N.Y.	Zablocki
Findley	Nedzi	Zion
Fish	Nelsen	Zwach

NOT VOTING—52

Anderson,	Hagan	Powell
Tenn.	Hastings	Rarick
Baring	Hays	Riegle
Berry	Jones, N.C.	Rosenthal
Brook	Kirwan	Ruth
Brooks	Langen	St Germain
Brown, Calif.	Latta	Scherle
Camp	Leggett	Stafford
Cederberg	Lennon	Stratton
Chisholm	Lukens	Symington
Dawson	McDonald,	Taft
Denney	Mich.	Teague, Calif.
Dennis	McEwen	Thompson, N.J.
Dickinson	Mikva	Tunney
Diggs	Morton	Watson
Edwards, La.	Moss	Whitehurst
Esch	Ottenger	
Frey	Pepper	
Green, Pa.	Pettis	

So the resolution was rejected.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Watson for, with Mr. Hays against.
Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.
Mr. Berry for, with Mr. Dennis against.
Mr. Langen for, with Mr. Stafford against.
Mr. Denney for, with Mr. Camp against.
Mr. Brock for, with Mr. Latta against.
Mr. Rarick for, with Mr. Mikva against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Whitehurst.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Ruth.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Symington with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. BRASCO, Mr. WHITE of Texas, Mr. BELL of California, Mr. MINSHALL, and Mr. TAYLOR changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the rule was rejected by the House be reconsidered and that request laid on the table.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the resolution just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND FOR THE WEEK COMMENCING MARCH 2, 1970

(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 and the schedule for next week.

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we have finished the business for the week and we

will ask to go over until Monday upon the announcement of next week's program.

Monday is Consent Calendar day. There are three suspensions:

S. 2593, to exclude certain persons from the numerical limitation of Western Hemisphere immigration;

H.R. 4574, to provide for the admission to the United States of certain inhabitants of the Bonin Islands; and

H.R. 914, for the relief of Hood River County, Ore.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week we have three bills, subject to rules being granted for each of them:

H.R. 11832, to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station;

H.R. 14169, expansion of agricultural exports; and

S. 2910, to authorize additional funds for the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and that any further program will be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT OVER UNTIL MONDAY, MARCH 2, 1970

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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE ON MONDAY, MARCH 2, 1970

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate on Monday, March 2.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

REQUEST MADE TO AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION FOR INVESTIGATION OF DEFENSE OF CHICAGO 7

(Mr. ICHORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I have in prior remarks to the House adverted to the trial of "the Chicago 7." The reprehensible attempt of the defendants, with the connivance of their attorneys, to make a mockery of our judicial system was a shocking occurrence, the effect of which will remain with us for some time. Equally disturbing has been the fact that such self-styled "revolutionaries" should receive significant support from the communications media which permitted itself to be fully exploited in the demeaning of the court and the prosecution.

The magnitude of this misconduct poses a serious challenge to the good repute and effective functioning of our legal system. The important issue is whether the bench and bar are capable of adjusting to the diversions of would-be revolutionaries and their counsel who would advance what appears to be a concept of class struggle in the courtroom and thus make a shambles of our legal system in what they regard as a step forward in their effort, fanciful as it may appear, to accomplish the ultimate overthrow of the system. My concern has prompted me to call upon the American Bar Association for a thorough review of this subject.

For the information of the House, I submit herewith a copy of a letter which I have forwarded to Bernard G. Segal, president of the American Bar Association. The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1970.

BERNARD G. SEGAL, Esquire,
President, American Bar Association,
1155 East 60th Street
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. SEGAL: Many members of Congress have become increasingly concerned that repeated assaults upon our judicial system by self-styled revolutionaries may work irreparable harm unless appropriate action is taken to curb them. The trial of the so-called Chicago 7 is the case in point. According to these self-styled revolutionaries on trial, as it is with others in "the Movement", the law is a "class" tool which must be "exposed". A trial is to them a confrontation with "the system" which they ultimately seek to destroy or transform.

It is clear that the Chicago defendants, with the connivance of their counsel, attempted deliberately to make a mockery of our judicial system. I am also particularly disturbed that the communications media in many instances permitted itself to be fully exploited to this end by obscuring the reprehensible nature of their conduct and demeaning the court and the prosecution without pointing out that judicial procedures provide the means of correcting errors by the court, if any.

The important question at issue is whether our legal system is capable of meeting the challenge thus posed. This challenge, inherent in the deepening conflict between what President Nixon has recently described as two irreconcilable philosophies, that of the "world revolutionary movement" and the system of freedom, is the major problem of our generation, now finding expression in steadily mounting attacks upon our legal system as in other areas of our society. If

we do not meet this challenge promptly, at the threshold, we shall be fated to witness the steady deterioration and degradation of our legal system, and with it the institutions of our free society.

Hence, it seems to me that our procedures and the circumstances must be thoroughly reviewed to determine what protective measures are necessary and what is the proper course for the disciplining of such defendants and their counsel consistently with the ends of justice and the dignified functioning of our trial system. These issues demand the attention of our best minds and our most informed experts. It is my thought that this subject should be thoroughly examined by the American Bar Association with a view toward remedial action on the part of the bar and bench, or by legislation, State and Federal, as may appear necessary.

I would very much appreciate your advice.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD H. ICHORD,
Chairman.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AND THE COMMUNIST ONSLAUGHT IN LAOS

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am both astounded and dismayed at the cavalier attitude which is being expressed toward Laos. Laos is a friendly nation which is fighting for its very existence and fighting with all its resources. The Communists, acting with complete disdain for their commitments on the neutrality of Laos, have for years occupied a very considerable portion of that country and used it as a broad avenue for carrying on their war of aggression in South Vietnam. Now they appear to be moving to overrun the remaining portions of that country. The frenzied outbursts which have been provoked in this country by the disclosure that a few Americans, not members of the Armed Forces, are trying to help stay the Communist onslaught will give aid and comfort to the enemy and serve to spur their drive for the subjugation of Laos. Undoubtedly, the world hears these statements with disbelief. How is it possible that responsible people in the United States respond in such manner to efforts to save a friendly nation from communism?

This gallant little country has fought Communist subjugation for 20 years. The number of Laotians in uniform represents a very high percentage of the population. An equivalent number in the armed services in the United States would be 10 million. Their losses in battle have been extremely high—much higher than any we have suffered in conflict. To abandon this country—and this is what some of the critics apparently are prepared to do—would be to turn our backs on the very principles we have been fighting for in South Vietnam. The march of communism is going on everywhere. We cannot be against it in one country and indifferent to it in another. Remember, the Communists get their greatest encouragement from American headlines, whether or not those headlines re-

flect the thinking of the American people.

Some of the criticism has been directed at G. McMurtrie Godley, U.S. Ambassador to Laos. I know Mr. Godley. He is a dedicated representative of the United States who has given outstanding service in one of the most difficult assignments in the world. The criticism toward the Ambassador is based upon an apparent slight to some newsmen who were looking for headlines. This is small reason to question the motives of the services of an able man who is working day and night to help prevent another small nation from being engulfed by the wave of communism. It is well to remind ourselves that the same newsmen would have received short shrift after a similar adventure in a Communist country.

The American people, and indeed the world, undoubtedly wonder how our foreign policy can hope to succeed in the face of criticism like this.

SETTLING AN OLD FEUD

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

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to warn my colleagues that on Tuesday next there will be a major eruption in one of the oldest, most bitter feuds in Washington. I refer of course to the athletic rivalry between the congressional Democrats and Republican foes and specifically to the congressional basketball game to be played at Washington Coliseum on Tuesday next. Each Democrat Member is furnishing his own uniform and cardiologist. Ax handles will not be distributed at the game.

Athletic events featuring Members of Congress are not unprecedented. We have had the yearly baseball games—the scores of which recent ones I decline to discuss; and occasionally we have had unscheduled, impromptu boxing matches in the corridors. But at long last we Democrats have discovered our thing.

The Democratic basketball club recruited by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) and myself is truly awesome. Further, we have been practicing regularly in preparation, taking buses to our various practice fields. I must report in all candor, however, that the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) refuses to be bused in either direction and that Senator RIBICOFF claims there is hypocrisy involved in our using this mode of transport.

However, neither talent nor practice is the key to the victory we shall achieve. It is strategy and I am so confident that in order to avoid a total rout I take the unusual step today of disclosing much of our game plan. This is a plan based in large part on our observations of political strategy by the administration now in power and application of these principles to the hardwood court.

One of our major offensive weapons is the Agnew hook which I have perfected just this week. It involves intimidating scowls and feigned throws at the press

table followed by a wild charge to the south end of the court shouting slogans, epithets and five syllable words. While the ball occasionally ends up in my mouth, 65 percent of the fans who have watched this maneuver approve of it.

Another key offensive play in addition to the Reagan dunk shot is the Hayns-worth-Carswell shuffle. In this maneuver we keep ending in a series of second and third stringers, one after the other, until one of them scores. We are also working on the Goodell shift, in which the entire team lines up on the right side of the court. When the captain shouts the key word "Senate" one player sprints to the far left and then heads in for an easy basket.

On defense we have a new shifting zone, though we prefer to label it the "bring us together" defense.

Regarding opponents, I seem to hear some loud and boastful noises coming out of their regional camps. There is a southern practice field in Aiken, S.C.; a western practice field near San Clemente, and a third somewhere in the Florida Keys. I am advised that the Republicans have been working out with Coach "Double-Dribble" Mitchell on a "do-not-watch-what-I-say-but-watch-what-I-do" offense. We do not intend to be taken in by this shabby kind of maneuver. Nor do we fear the tricks conjured by Assistant Coach Wally Hickel, formerly of the Santa Barbara Oilers.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to leave two final words of warning. First, if our team does not have a clear lead by halftime, as coach of this team I shall not hesitate to Nixonize our offense. This clever move simply means that if our five-man team cannot win, we will just take out our two forwards with confidence that the remaining members will achieve victory. Finally, this game is billed as the first annual congressional basketball game. It will be that, but should we lose it will also be the last annual game, because, gentlemen, you will not have us Democrats to kick around any more.

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

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I would like to ask the gentleman from Arizona, is this the team coached by the two fighting Democrats, Diggs and Maddox?

Mr. UDALL. No; it is not.

REPUBLICAN ECONOMIC POLICIES ARE FAILING THE PEOPLE OF THIS COUNTRY

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the problem of accelerated inflation and higher cost of living, coupled with the recessionary trends of increased unemployment and smaller paychecks in the 14 months of this administration, poses one of the most serious problems facing this country. Millions of Americans continue to feel the pinch of failing Republican

economic policies which have brought excessive interest rates that favor the big moneyed interests at the expense of the wage earner, the housewife, the retired, and their families.

In the first 14 months of this administration we have seen almost unprecedented acceleration in inflation—6.1 percent in 1969 with the rate going up even faster in the last quarter. And, the wholesale price index of January, increasing at an annual rate of 8.4 percent, indicates the growing severity of the problems.

It is with some surprise that I read the statement of the distinguished minority leader of yesterday, in which he said the administration is making a "constructive effort to solve the inherited problem of inflation."

If the actions of the President in publicly giving a green light to big industry to raise prices to the maximum is constructive, then Webster's definition of the word is wrong. The administration's stubborn refusal to use the credit control powers legislated by a concerned Congress last year is certainly not a constructive step. The excessive tight-money policies which are strangling the housing industry, demoralizing small business, frightening stockowners and spreading inflation can, by no logic known to me, be construed as constructive.

The effort by the gentleman from Michigan to blame the Democrats is not so surprising, for it seems to be the continuing effort of the Republicans to reject the responsibility that goes with the control of the executive branch. As for this Congress, it provided a surplus in the 1970 budget, and trimmed over \$5½ billion from the President's own requests to balance the budget. Further, I remind my colleague from Michigan that administration spokesmen said repeatedly during last year that it was getting the situation under control. They failed then and they are failing now.

The minority leader can continue to seek political gain from seeking to blame Democrats. I would remind him however that it is a Republican administration and Republican economic policies which are failing the people of this country.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL AT THE CABINET LEVEL

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to see the faint glimmer of hope in this Nation's efforts to curb pollution. For some time, I have urged a coordinated movement within the Government to bring together all the various agencies, committees, special study groups, departments, and deadwood under one big umbrella.

Bureaucracy is taking its toll in the Federal efforts to improve our environment. I found at least 20 major areas of Federal jurisdiction in pollution, and I was amazed. Upon closer look, I found 31

empires with little or no coordination. Surely, I have missed some.

How can this Government scatter its authority and still do an effective job?

We have seen tender suggestions that the Department of the Interior has asked to be renamed the Department of Environment and Natural Resources. Rather than just create new letterheads for that Department, I urge that we give them the power and the authority to coordinate all Federal efforts by the many, many agencies involved.

Last night, the Washington Evening Star editorially spoke to this point:

INTERIOR MAKEOVER

A while back, the President proclaimed to Congress and the country his administration's dedication to saving the environment. He outlined a highly commendable program to halt the poisoning of the planet. He made the initial moves required to get the legislative machinery moving on the long, expensive road to reclamation.

There is one more basic step to be taken before the process of making the planet once again reasonably safe for living things can really get started.

At present, the task of keeping an eye on the environment is spread around through an abundance of departments and agencies. Meanwhile other departments and agencies—equal in authority to the ecological watchdogs—are busily polluting everything within reach, while they fulfill their assigned tasks of killing unwanted plant and animal life, providing cheap sewage facilities for military establishments, or whatever.

The need is for one department to serve as overseer for the entire antipollution drive, with authority to halt any detrimental activities being carried on by any other branch of government. And the obvious candidate for the job is the present Interior Department.

Such a move would end the patent absurdity of having one department—Interior—responsible for ending water pollution, while the Department of Health, Education and Welfare guards against the poisoning of the air. It would prevent such bureaucratic monstrosities as the continued use by the Agriculture Department of mercury-treated seeds that have been labeled poisonous to men and livestock by the Food and Drug Administration. It would, in short, bring the beginnings of order out of present administrative chaos.

The proposal is not new. It has been suggested by—among others—Interior Secretary Hickel. His suggestion is that the present function of Interior as overseer of the natural resources should be continued, so that decisions concerning the advisability of tapping these resources and the methods to be used will be based on the total effect the completed operation will have on the environment.

The suggestion has also been made that the Interior Department should rid itself of many miscellaneous duties that it inherited as it evolved as the government's administrative catch-all, spreading such responsibilities as Micronesia, the Alaskan Railroad and American Indians among the other existing agencies. A further suggestion is that Interior should be renamed to become the Department of Environment and Resources.

Whatever the mechanics and whatever the name, the concept of a single department with the responsibility of coordinating the war on pollution is sound. It may, in fact, be vital—in the literal sense of that word.

Now, let me illustrate my point that we have too many watchdogs and not

one single keeper of the hounds. In the January 31 edition, the National Journal did a creditable job of enumerating the ecological seers. Before reading through this list, bear in mind that this—although it appears to be lengthy—only scratches the surface.

GOVERNMENT'S ENVIRONMENT OFFICES PROLIFERATE

"Environment," the latest trigger word in Washington, threatens to establish more new offices in the federal government than anything since "poverty." Throughout the departments and agencies, as well as within the White House, environmental divisions and management positions are being created—some for hard work ahead, some perhaps for fashion's sake.

So rapid is the proliferation of environmental offices that the government itself has been unable to keep count.

Amory H. Bradford, chairman of the Environment and Natural Resources Study Group of the President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization, says his group is just beginning to compile a list. So is the Library of Congress. The office of Executive Branch Communications Director Herbert G. Klein is waiting for the new Council on Environmental Quality to begin counting.

The idea of extensive environmental planning may be relatively recent in Washington, but phenomenon of shifting and stretching offices is not. "It's almost a hang-up," said David Walker, an assistant director of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. "We've gone through this game before with the Johnson Administration."

"Creating federal bureaus and reorganizing them never cleaned up anything," grumbled Thomas L. Kimball, executive director of the National Wildlife Federation.

So far, the emphasis on environment has not brought an enormous expansion of the bureaucracy—only movement. For the most part, existing offices have been restructured and renamed, and many of the new directors of environmental affairs have come from other positions within their departments or agencies. Staffs are small and often have other duties.

Listed below are some of the major environment offices and committees, by whatever name, which are now in business. A few have been around for over a year, but most are much newer.

WHITE HOUSE

Council on Environmental Quality: Almost certain to be the most important of the new offices, the council will consist of three full-time advisers to the President, with a large staff and an authorized budget of \$1 million to develop national environmental policies.

The council was created by Congress at the end of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) in bills sponsored by Sen. Henry M. Jackson, D-Wash., and Rep. John D. Dingell, D-Mich. The Administration originally opposed the legislation.

Council members, appointed by President Nixon Jan. 29, are Chairman Russell E. Train, Under Secretary of the Interior; Robert Cahn, Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter on the environment for the *Christian Science Monitor*; and Gordon J. F. MacDonald, geologist, geophysicist and administrator of the University of California at Santa Barbara.

(MacDonald was a member of last year's special White House panel that unanimously recommended the resumption of drilling in the Santa Barbara Channel to relieve pressure on an offshore field that produced a major oil leak. The panel's report was criticized by Sen. Edmund S. Muskie, D-Maine, and Sen. Alan Cranston, D-Calif., and

MacDonald's participation might produce a controversy at his confirmation hearings.)

Another White House office, which President Nixon said Jan. 1 he would rather do without, would be established in a pending bill (HR 4148) that passed both houses last year and still is in conference. This office, suggested by Muskie, would provide a full-time staff to review federal agencies' programs and to assist the council established by the Jackson bill.

Environmental Quality Council: This Cabinet-level committee was created by President Nixon May 29 (Executive Order 11472) to foster cooperation among the departments directly involved—Agriculture, Commerce, Housing and Urban Development, Interior, Transportation, Health, Education and Welfare—and to anticipate environmental problems.

The Council's staff of three or four is led by Presidential Science Adviser Lee A. DuBridge, former president of the California Institute of Technology, and Director of the Office of Science and Technology. The President Jan. 29 renamed the Council the Cabinet Committee on the Environment.

Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality: In May, President Nixon renamed the 15-member Citizens' Advisory Committee on Recreation and Natural Beauty formed during the Johnson Administration. The committee, which serves without pay, advises the President and the Cabinet. Chairman Laurance S. Rockefeller also attends meetings of the Cabinet-level Environmental Quality Council.

President's Task Force on Air Pollution: Created Nov. 18, 1969, this is one of several task forces under Presidential Special Assistant Charles L. Clapp. The 11 members, all from outside government, are headed by Arie Haagen-Smit, bio-organic chemist and chairman of California's Air Pollution Control Board. The task force has no permanent staff and has met several times.

THE DEPARTMENTS

Interior: Secretary Walter J. Hickel has expressed his hope of transforming Interior into a Department of Environment and Natural Resources. For the time being, due primarily to the transfer of Under Secretary Train to the President's Council on Environmental Quality, the department's new staff effort for environment is leaderless.

Last spring an Environmental Planning Staff was created in the Under Secretary's office with department-wide responsibility for policy review. The planning staff's half-dozen professionals were headed then by Boston Attorney John R. Quarles, but he has since become Secretary Hickel's assistant. They have been working in the Under Secretary's Office. A Johnson Administration Office of Ecology within Interior was abolished a year ago.

Several divisions and bureaus of Interior are re-emphasizing environment. For example, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration in January moved Allan Hirsch to the new office of Assistant Commissioner for Environmental and Program Planning.

Transportation: Shortly after he took office, Transportation Secretary John A. Volpe established a new assistant secretaryship for urban systems and environment. Since the department is limited by law to five assistant secretaryships, Volpe combined two of the old posts into one to make room for the new job. During the summer, the new title was reversed: J. D. Braman, the former Seattle mayor who holds the post, now is known as Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Affairs. Braman's staff numbers 25 now, and will soon reach 40. Its job is to examine the environmental impact of transportation plans, programs and technology.

Health, Education, and Welfare: The National Air Pollution Control Administration and the Environmental Control Administration (including the Bureaus of Solid Waste Management, Water Hygiene and Radiological Health) have been grouped under the Public Health Service's Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service. As of Feb. 1, 1970, the words "Consumer Protection" are dropped from the latter title; other organizational changes are expected. The department lost its water pollution control program to Interior in 1966, and now is wary of Interior's intentions toward its air pollution office. Spokesmen for both the HEW and Interior Departments have indicated that Hickel would like to gain control over air pollution.

U.S. Commissioner of Education James E. Allen announced Jan. 23 that his office will stress "environmental education" through the 1970s. A special staff will be given the task of coordinating and designing such studies. In June the Office of Education will convene a major conference on environmental and ecological education.

Agriculture: Secretary Clifford M. Hardin created an Environmental Quality Executive Committee in October to coordinate environmental aspects of the department's many natural resources programs. The 11 committee members are authorized to speak for their agencies in policy discussions. The chairman is Theodore C. Byerly, Assistant Director of Science and Education for the Secretary, and a biologist with 38 years in the Agriculture Department. There is only one staff worker.

State: To the surprise of many, the State Department created an Office of Environmental Affairs in December. Evidently, it will lead the federal government's battles against the international effects of pollution and will represent the United States at world conferences in 1971 and 1972. Christian A. Herter Jr., 51, son of the former Republican Secretary of State, directs a professional staff of about seven, plus an office force.

Commerce: Generally, the department's main activities in the field—such as the Weather Bureau—come under the Environmental Science Services Administration (ESSA), created in July 1965. ESSA's main mission is to perform research.

Defense: Two advisory groups, the Defense Environmental Control Committee and the Natural Resources Directorate, have been in existence for some time and will continue. The Army Corps of Engineers, long a target of conservation groups, in recent years has established environmental branches in its major divisions, according to its public affairs office.

OTHER AGENCIES

Federal Power Commission: An Office of Adviser on Environmental Quality was created Dec. 29 to evaluate methods of producing, transmitting and delivering electricity and natural gas, and to advise the commission on environmental protection. The new adviser is Frederick H. Warren, 59, a civil engineer and former chairman of the board of the NUS Corp. in Rockville, Md. On Jan. 28, the commission named a 10-man government-industry task force on environment to assist in this year's updating of the National Power Survey.

Tennessee Valley Authority: In July a new Division of Environmental Research and Development was added to the Office of Health and Environmental Science. The division, headed by F. E. Gartrell, is testing new equipment and processes for the National Pollution Control Administration.

Smithsonian Institution: In September the Office of Environmental Sciences was formed from two other offices to assist the Smithsonian's scientists. The office has a pro-

fessional staff of seven. Its director is I. E. Wallen.

Early in 1969 the Smithsonian established its Center for the Study of Short-Lived Phenomena to keep track of ecological oddities around the world.

Atomic Energy Commission: In September, Joseph J. DiNunzio was appointed to a new post as special assistant for environmental affairs to the AEC General Manager; he has been examining the environmental impact of AEC policies and activities.

CONGRESS

House Government Operations Subcommittee on Conservation and Natural Resources: Reorganized a year ago from the Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power, its jurisdiction now includes many environmental matters. Chairman is Rep. Henry Reuss, D-Wis.

Senate Commerce Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources and the Environment: An entirely new subcommittee formed a year ago, it is beginning to exercise oversight on government/environment issues. Chairman is Sen. Philip A. Hart, D-Mich.

Senate Public Works Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution: Created as a special subcommittee in 1963 and given permanent status in 1965, this has been chaired from the beginning by Muskie. It is interested in all bills pertaining to pollution and has written many major laws, such as the 1966 Clean Waters Restoration Act.

Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service (LRS), Environmental Policy Division: This division was created in September 1969 from the LRS natural resources section. It conducts research and prepares reports on the environment for Congress, and currently is one of the library's busiest divisions. Its professional staff of 15 plus an office force is led by Richard A. Carpenter, a chemist formerly in the library's Science Policy Research Division.

With all the headline hunting attendant to this Government's environmental control "magic" policies, we have created a spin-off pollution problem. In every congressional office, the mail on pollution is picking up in dramatic proportions. Consequentially, the Library of Congress is being flooded with requests for data, information, any shred of information that can be used to answer a concerned constituent.

Because the demand on the staff is so great, the Library of Congress on February 18 held a briefing session to explain where congressional offices might go for this much-needed information. I do not mean to slight the efforts of the Library staff, they did an excellent job in providing source material. But, this only highlights the problem.

For example, I direct your attention to this score sheet prepared by the Library—it tells a stark, simple story of just how thin the Government is spread in this, one of the most vital issues of our generation:

CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES WITH JURISDICTION IN AIR AND WATER POLLUTION AND SOLID WASTES MANAGEMENT

SENATE COMMITTEES

Agriculture and Forestry.
Commerce: Subcommittees on Energy, Natural Resources and the Environment.
Government Operations: Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Operations.
Interior and Insular Affairs.
Labor and Public Welfare: Subcommittee on Health.

Public Works: Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution.

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Agriculture.
Government Operations: Subcommittee on Conservation and Natural Resources.
Interior and Insular Affairs.
Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation.
Subcommittee on Oceanography.
Public Works:
Subcommittee on Flood Control.
Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors.
Science and Astronautics: Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development.

JOINT COMMITTEE

Atomic Energy.

FEDERAL POLLUTION CONTROL OFFICES AIR POLLUTION

National Air Pollution Control Administration, Office of Public Information, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, Md. 20852. Phone: 443-1677.

WATER POLLUTION

Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, Congressional and Correspondence Services, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Va. 22202. Phone: Code 167-7373.

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

Bureau of Solid Waste Management, Office of Information, 12720 Twinbrook Parkway, Rockville, Md. 20852. Phone: 495 (or code 146)-7931.

Mr. Speaker, in this morning's Washington Post, a White House aide is quoted as saying that the administration will, indeed, coordinate the unwieldy machinery into one efficient operation.

I, for one, sincerely hope this is not just another press release. I trust the administration is serious and will implement their spoken words with action.

GOVERNOR MADDOX SHOULD NOT BE BARRED FROM HOUSE DINING ROOM

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the easiest course for me in the incident involving the Georgia Governor would be to remain silent and allow the Governor of my State, who is incidentally a member of the same party as the authors of the resolution, to be verbally pilloried for the events in the House dining room. I could also take comfort in the fact that I worked against the election of the Governor, ardently supporting the Republican candidate who received several thousand more votes but who was denied the office by a Democrat-dominated State legislature utilizing an archaic provision in our State constitution. But, in good conscience, Mr. Speaker, I cannot remain silent, no matter how much I might disapprove of the Governor's actions.

Lester Garfield Maddox is the Governor of my State by virtue of the laws of my State and the actions of its duly elected State legislators. Therefore, he should be accorded all the rights and

respect due him as Governor, even though I disagree with him on certain issues. He resides in my congressional district as a private citizen, and the Governor's mansion is also located in my district and I, therefore, represent him in Congress. I regret that the incident took place and I cannot condone it, yet I cannot sit idly by and allow him to be given the status of "persona non grata" in the House dining room, when they give the Governors of all States this right.

Mr. Speaker, I might remind the authors of the resolution that many of the individuals whom they have defended in the past have been guilty of conduct which has been just as deeply offensive to many Americans. For example, I recall that during the debate on the legislation during the 90th Congress to make it a Federal crime to burn and defile the American flag, one of the cosponsors of this resolution took the floor to proclaim such legislation would seriously limit the right of free expression under the first amendment. I most heartily disagree with that reasoning, and yet I must remind the cosponsors that Lester G. Maddox has just as much right to express his opinions as an American as do those who would do so by defacing or desecrating the American flag.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of the fact that some of the cosponsors of this resolution heatedly opposed the antiriot statute when it was approved by Congress. This is the very statute which was the basis for the trial and conviction of defendants in the so-called Chicago seven trial recently. Many Americans were deeply offended by the actions of those defendants, yet some of the cosponsors of this resolution were opposed to legislation which would make it a crime to travel from one State to another for the purpose of inciting riots. Here again, it was contended that such a law would limit the right of free expression under the Constitution.

Granted, Mr. Speaker, the House dining room is an inappropriate place for such activity as the placing of souvenir ax handles, and if I had had any control over the Governor's actions, I would have done my utmost to prevent it, but I do not as he is not even of my party. Nevertheless, for this House to now take the official position that the Governor, representing 4½ million citizens of my State, shall henceforth be barred from the privileges of the House dining room because he placed in the lobby a box of souvenir ax handles which I considered an offensive souvenir and even though I differ with him, is far too extreme and unjustified by the circumstances. I, therefore, urge that the resolution be defeated.

OUR EVER-GROWING NATIONAL DEBT

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, a week ago today, I advised this distinguished body of my grave concern for the fact that, in fiscal year 1971, the American

people will be compelled to spend more than \$18 billion in interest, alone, on the ever-growing national debt which is now in excess of \$360 billion.

I said then, and I repeat now, that in return for this payment which the American people can ill afford, "the American people will receive nothing. They will just be paying the bill for fiscal irresponsibility and deficit spending, of which, for almost four decades, this Government has been guilty virtually every year with only few exceptions."

Virtually every year throughout this period, the President of the United States has submitted an administrative budget higher than the year before. Frequently, it has been an unbalanced budget—the essence of deficit spending which, in turn, is the root cause of the fiscal crisis we suffer today.

These unbalanced administrative budgets have been shattered by a Congress which, virtually every year, has legislated programs and granted appropriations which have added multiple billions of dollars to that already out-of-balance budget. This has come through budgetary increases and supplementary appropriations.

Each year front-page headlines have been given to the amount of money which Presidents have sought in their budgetary message. All too generally, however, not so much as an inch of space has been given to these additional multiple billion dollar sums which, collectively, Congress has added to the Presidential requests.

In short, while it is true that the President of the United States must and does frame a budget with which he hopes the Government can live, it is also true that one of the most basic constitutional powers of the Congress is the power of the purse. It is the Congress which must levy the taxes. It is the Congress which must approve the national debt limit.

It is, therefore, not quite enough for Members of Congress to point the finger of blame at the Chief Executive or at his fiscal experts, advisers and planners. The Congress must also point the finger of blame at itself. It is not enough for Members of Congress to point the finger of blame across the political aisle. Both branches of Government, and both political parties, have been guilty of whistling past the fiscal graveyard.

It is, therefore, my purpose to help turn the tide back toward fiscal sanity and financial integrity. In that interest, I offer the suggestion that our Government must begin to practice what every American breadwinner knows he must practice if he is to survive financially; namely, that he cannot spend more money than he earns, and that when he borrows money, he must know how, and from what source, he is going to be able to repay it. He knows that from his weekly paycheck he must budget not only the necessary amount of money for life's essentials, but he must also budget a sufficient amount of money with which to repay what he has borrowed. It is in this spirit, therefore, that, today, I introduced the following concurrent resolution:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that, in order to establish and maintain a sound fiscal policy, each budget submitted to the Congress by the President should include specific provisions for bringing about a net reduction in the national debt of at least \$10,000,000,000 during the fiscal year for which such budget is submitted.

Mr. Speaker, given self-discipline on the part of the executive and legislative branches of Government and on the part of capital, industry, and labor, we can, in this way, begin to reduce our national debt. In my opinion, no task is more necessary. Therefore, I ask the most serious and conscientious consideration of the Congress of this simple proposal for solution of this most complex problem.

AGRICULTURE'S CREDIT NEEDS

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, since enactment of the Consumer Credit Protection Act in the 90th Congress, farmers seeking loans for their normal business operations have been subjected to what apparently has become an unreasonable amount of unwarranted, inconvenient and time-consuming detail incidental to borrowing funds.

The advancement of agricultural technology within relatively recent years has caused an ever-increasing need for capital with which to make possible efficient and effective utilization of this technology.

In today's modern agriculture, credit has become a working tool which farmers and ranchers use as readily as they use any other facility when it is advantageous to do so. As a result, the vast majority of farm and ranch operators have become as skilled as other businessmen in obtaining and applying borrowed funds when such funds can increase efficiency and reduce per-unit costs. They understand as well as operators of other types of businesses the responsibilities—and the charges—which go with borrowing from established credit institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the Truth-in-Lending Act and the regulations essential to its administration ever were intended to hamper farmers and ranchers in their customary credit transactions; however, the communications I have received from constituents leave no doubt that administration of the Truth-in-Lending Act is hampering these operations. I am sure other Members of this body have received similar communications.

To remedy this situation, I am today offering a bill to eliminate from the act inclusion of loans for agricultural purposes. This action would put farmers and ranchers on the same basis as other businessmen, since loans for business or commercial purposes were exempted from provisions of the act when it was enacted.

Removal of loans for agricultural purposes by enactment of this bill would necessitate revision by the Federal Reserve Board of regulations implementing the act. The revised regulations should make

abundantly clear that the loans which are removed from the act by my amendment are those loans for carrying on the business of farming or ranching. These would be loans obtained to finance purchase of goods, including equipment, or services to be used in production of agricultural commodities for market.

There is no intention to remove from the act any loan obtained for personal, household or family purposes simply because the borrower happens to be engaged in farming or ranching. No change would be made with respect to a credit extension for purchase of an automobile, for example, or a washing machine, dryer, television receiver or other item or service not used in agricultural production.

Credit is an essential ingredient in an agricultural industry. Enactment of this amendment will go far toward facilitating continued use of this indispensable resource.

FOREIGN BLACKMAIL

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, there has never been a more classic example of the unmitigated folly of this Government's foreign aid program than was provided last week in Manila when an uncontrolled mob of hundreds of Filipino students and workers repeatedly attacked and tried to sack and burn the U.S. Embassy.

Only the courage of the U.S. Marine guard and the liberal use of gas grenades and other weapons prevented destruction of the Embassy although it sustained severe damage.

Officials of the Philippine Government, who could have broken up the mob and kept it away from the Embassy, did not raise a finger until the rioters had been beaten back.

Then, to add insufferable insult to the mob's injury, Philippine Foreign Minister Carlos Romulo arrogantly maintained that "there must be a cause for the public indignation thus expressed."

He said:

It may be well for the American Embassy to ponder such legitimate grievances.

He referred to the mob's angry denunciation, alleging "U.S. imperialism and fascism."

Romulo, as many Americans will recall, is a former President of the Philippines who was subsequently elevated to tin-god status in this country and the United Nations, and who is responsible, in a large part, for the taxpayers of this country being bled to the tune of nearly \$2 billion in economic handouts. Only an adding machine could provide the additional millions in military aid since American GI's bailed out his homeland in World War II.

And now, after living off our largesse for the last quarter of a century, this little pipsqueak Romulo has the gall to support criticism of Americans as "fascists" and "imperialists."

Our State Department handout artists asked last year for still another \$6.7 million for President Marcos, Romulo, and

their friends, and got most of it. This year, having fully demonstrated their ingratitude, they will undoubtedly try to blackmail us for far more and demand that our Subic Bay naval base be turned over, lock, stock, and barrel, for good measure.

The time has come for Uncle Sucker to cut them off without another dime.

THE PHILIPPINES, A LAND OF INGRATITUDE

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

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I agree with what the gentleman from Iowa has said. Former President Romulo must have a very short memory. I was here during the war when this country was his only haven of refuge, and I remember the money which was paid to him out of our Treasury. I remember the countless other honorariums he has received from lecturing in America.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time these ingrates in the Philippines have turned a deaf ear to our people. I was over there shortly after \$50,000 was taken from one of our officers clubs on a base; the people involved disappeared, and the Philippine Government not only did not raise a hand to do something about it, but that was the last we heard of it.

Mr. Speaker, we may have to reap-praise our position in the Philippines in relation to the things we are doing as well as the position of our bases in this land of ingratitude.

SCOUR THE PLOWSHARE AND GO DEEPER FOR REAL AGRICULTURE FACTS

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, sometimes newspaper columnists a long way from the soil get into a strange field and only scratch the surface rather than plow deeply to get the full facts. Dan Oberdorfer in this morning's Washington Post falls victim to the weedy type of Department of Agriculture statistical reporting, causing him to say that 6 percent of 3 million American farmers and ranchers produce 50 percent of our agricultural products.

I am not critical of Mr. Oberdorfer, who was misled by the report he reads. I am critical of the sort of statistical reports which caused him to say that 6 percent of the 3,000,000 farmers in the United States produce 50 percent of farm commodities.

They do no such thing.

Scour the plowshare and try for a straight furrow; let us get the facts.

People like Mr. Oberdorfer are confused by USDA statistics, which say that so many operators had cash receipts of \$23.2 billion dollars out of \$47.8 billion for all farmers. This in 1968 totals 194,000, or 6.4 percent, of all farmers in the United States.

This 194,000 may have had gross receipts of nearly 50 percent of total farm receipts, but they produced a much smaller fraction of the total "agricultural output" referred to by Mr. Oberdorfer.

Let me give you an example: In 1968, 2,000 of the largest feedlots in the United States marketed more than half of the fed cattle, but these lots actually produced little of what they marketed. They were, in a sense, processors of what others produced.

Most of these feedlot owners bought "feeder" cattle from farmers and ranchers who actually produced the animals. And they bought feed grains from farmers who actually produced them. Then they fed the grains to the feeder cattle, sold them as fed cattle, and the USDA's records show that the big feeders got the lion's share of receipts from beef cattle sales in the United States—the figures that Mr. Oberdorfer used. The thousands and thousands of farmers and ranchers who provided the feeders and the feed were the real basic producers. The feedlot operators combined their product, providing the blending and finishing.

This Congress, and the American people, are entitled to a better understanding of the real nature of the farm situation than the sort of generalizations provided newspaper reporters and columnists like Mr. Oberdorfer.

The impression that such columns and reports are leaving with the public is that 180,000 farmers produce half or more of the 40 million cattle and calves which were slaughtered last year, more than half of the 10.7 million sheep and lambs slaughtered, more than half of the 84 million hogs which were butchered; that they produced more than 50 percent of 4.6 billion bushels of corn, more than half of 1.5 billion bushels of wheat, a billion bushels of soybeans, nearly a billion bushels of oats, a half billion bushels of barley, three-fourths billion bushels of grain sorghum, 307 million bushels of potatoes and 28½ million tons of sugarbeets.

In their spare time, presumably the same 180,000 farmers, produced more than half of all our peas, carrots, lettuce, avocados, peanuts, cabbages, oranges, apples, plums, cauliflower, plantago ovata, pulses, sugarcane, hay, rye, barley, cherries, clover, alfalfa, lespedeza, timothy, lawnglass and other seeds, tobacco, popcorn, maple sirup, honey, chickens, eggs, broomcorn, hops, pears, prunes, apricots, figs, nectarines, dates, California olives, pomegranates, tung nuts, almonds, filberts, pecans, walnuts, tangelos, tangerines, and that odd new citrus product known as "Ugli-ies."

Of course, that is only a partial list. Then there are chicken, eggs, and turkeys. Less than 180,000 farmers could have been involved in the production of the items I have mentioned so far, because I haven't bothered to name watermelons, canteloupe, onions, radishes, pineapples, ducks, goats, geese, cucumbers, squash, pumpkin, and a little item they grow across the southern part of this country called cotton.

When these farmers had all this done, they would still have a little twice-daily chore of milking about 15 million cows—50 apiece—to keep us in milk, cheese, and butter.

I doubt that even the fabled ranch of television fame—the Ponderosa Ranch which is the setting for "Bonanza"—would get into the elite 6 percent, for the evidence indicates that they only have feeder cattle—and have shirked producing all of these other agricultural products.

It is preposterous to indicate to the American people that about 300,000 farmers are all we need.

If we attain the objective of 300,000 farms, you and I are going to have some mighty restricted menus, and the quality is going to be considerably poorer than it is today. We will be living on bread, hominy, and hamburgers, for we will not be able to spare any of the basic producers to the "value-added" operations like feeding our cattle, or to frills like fruits, nuts, lettuce, and any mass-produced vegetables—potatoes, maybe. When we reduce the number of farmers we will also reduce the variety and quality of our diet.

Yes, Mr. Columnist, what serves best in this computerized, supersonic age, is one or two simple figures—capsulized data that is supposed to lead to quick solutions of all the problems. But the data being used to indicate that 88 percent of all farmers are unnecessary, and the remaining 12 percent would be too well-fixed to need a farm program, misrepresents the realities.

Here are some of those realities:

The average age of the 3 million farmers and ranchers in America is 53 years—which does not indicate prosperous and thriving business that young people enter.

Only 16 percent of the Nation's disposable income goes for food—the lowest in our history and the lowest of any major nation in all the history of the world, and yet this buys the most wholesome, the most varied, and nutritious food available in any nation on earth.

Only 5 percent of the disposal income of the Nation actually gets back to the farm producers, including both the big and the small—the rest of the 16 percent is for foreign products or mark-ups in the distribution system.

And how are the farmers faring?

Mr. and Mrs. Wheat Farmer sell wheat at \$1.25—the 1948 price, or 5 percent of a fair price, or parity.

Mr. and Mrs. Corn Farmer sell corn at \$1.12; they are getting 64 percent of a fair price, or parity. Feed grains were nearly all selling down in the low sixties.

Wool is bringing 41 cents of parity.

Oranges and tangerines are at 30 and 32 percent of parity.

Beef cattle on the hoof, supposedly high priced, are actually at only 82 percent of parity.

On the cost side, Mr. and Mrs. Farmer and Mr. and Mrs. Rancher are paying for everything they buy at prices which compare, unfortunately with current high interest rates—9 and 10 percent per year—the highest in all of their 53

years. Tractors and gasoline and other farm supplies—including interest and taxes and excluding only fertilizer—are the highest in all history. All in all the agricultural producers sell their products at low prices, have high costs, and are in tough times.

Now let me divert back a moment to products we might miss.

I forgot about beeswax.

I wonder if those 180,000 farmers referred to in Don Oberdorfer's column would produce 50 percent of our beeswax requirements.

Maybe it is none of our beeswax, as the hip kids of an earlier generation used to say.

But 50 percent of farm production on 6 percent of our farms?

It is simply a preposterous oversimplification of the agricultural situation that the public is entitled to understand at least a little better than that.

If they do not; if national policy is going to be made on the basis of the Oberdorfer generalities and we wipe out 90 percent of farmers, get ready for beef, ground into hamburger patties, bread, and hominy. Variety and quality will have to go, along with the real food bargain the American people enjoy today.

OUR MILITARY ROLE IN LAOS

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

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this country's military role in Laos grows more alarming every day. Scores of reports—reports from highly reliable sources, I should point out—indicate that U.S. military advisers veritably teem over Laotian bases. Indeed, some reports maintain that the number of military advisers guiding Laotian troops surpasses the number of advisers working in South Vietnam under the Kennedy administration. Still further reports, cited yesterday by Senators MATHIAS and MANSFIELD, contend that hundreds of former Green Berets have been recruited by the CIA for military operations in Laos. Chafing under the political restrictions that limit their activities in Vietnam—restrictions they term "handcuffs"—these Green Berets reportedly joined the CIA so they could exercise their combat skills with what is tantamount to a kind of military carte blanche in Laos. Our military activities there are reminiscent—chillingly reminiscent—of our activities in South Vietnam a decade ago. Step by step, inch by inch, the United States is being drawn into a war that threatens to engulf Laos within a few years.

U.S. military advisers are increasing in number virtually day by day. Combat forays into the countryside and its hamlets are increasing. Bombing sorties launched from carriers or land bases are increasing. And North Vietnam's response—a quite predictable response, if we have learned anything at all from 10 years of war in Vietnam—has been a proportionate increase in its own military thrust there.

Without the knowledge of the Ameri-

can people—indeed, without the full knowledge of the Congress—the United States is steadily approaching the brink of another full-scale war in Southeast Asia.

Have we learned nothing from our harrowing decade in Vietnam? Have we learned nothing from scores of pledges from our military leaders—pledges that just one more escalatory step, just one more combat division or just one more fleet of warplanes, would bring the Communists to their knees? Have we learned nothing from the slow process that eventually left Vietnam's cities in rubble, its hamlets in flames, hundreds of thousands dead and billions of dollars wasted?

We in the Congress must not countenance the kind of military intervention that kindled a disastrous war in Vietnam and threatens to kindle an equally disastrous war in Laos. We should—indeed, we must—exercise our responsibilities in shaping this Nation's foreign policy. The administration's activities in Laos are being carried out without even the most cursory attempt to inform the Congress and solicit its guidance. The Congress—and the Congress alone—has the constitutional right to declare war.

I am filing, today, with the Clerk of the House a resolution demanding that the administration reveal precisely and explicitly the extent of our military operations in Laos, and calling on him not to increase these operations without the clear consent of the Congress.

One Vietnam is enough.

The American people—and its representatives in the Congress—will not tolerate another one.

FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

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

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, between February 21 and 28, this country observes FFA Week. During this week the Future Farmers of America will conduct special events expressly designed to emphasize agriculture and the role it will play in our future.

I am proud to join in paying tribute to these outstanding young people.

I include for the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Sand Mountain Reporter, of Albertville, Ala. This article appropriately gives a well-deserved pat-on-the-back to our Future Farmers. The editorial follows:

FUTURE FARMERS

Agriculture, while still basic to survival, has become far removed from the knowledge of most of us. The nation depends upon today's agri-businessmen, who have made a science of farming. Like any science, farming requires an early start in life for those who wish to become successful agriculturists.

Between February 21 and 28, the country will be observing FFA Week. During this week the Future Farmers of America, a national organization with 450,000 students studying vocational agriculture in 9,000 public schools, will conduct special events expressly designed to emphasize agriculture and the role it will play in our future.

FFA Week is nationally celebrated beginning the Saturday before George Washington's Birthday and ending the following Saturday. George Washington made significant contributions to American agriculture, in addition to his military and patriotic contribution. The FFA recognizes him in their ceremonies, and especially during FFA Week.

One farmer now feeds scores of people. Thus, the responsibility of those who turn to agriculture as a business is heavy, and the young people of the FFA and other farm organizations who have elected to devote their lives to the production of food and fiber need every bit of support we can give them.

THOMAS F. PATTON OFFERS GREAT MESSAGE TO YOUTH

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have known Thomas F. Patton since high school days. He has achieved a distinguished record as a leader in business and in civic and community affairs.

In our native Cleveland he serves as board chairman and chief executive officer of Republic Steel Corp., and as a member of the executive board of the Greater Cleveland Council and region IV executive committee of Boy Scouts of America.

Although this might be enough for many men, Thomas F. Patton manages to engage, with great distinction, in myriad other activities through which the people of Greater Cleveland richly benefit. The many honors which he has received are too numerous to recite here except to note that Ohio State law school graduate Tom Patton has honorary doctorates of law, not just from his alma mater, but from Case-Western Reserve University, Akron, John Carroll, and Dayton Universities.

Most recently, his address before an Eagle Scout recognition ceremony was so magnificent as to merit description, in the vernacular of today's young, as a "now" message.

Though, indeed, the commentary of the "now" generation is of great importance, it is my belief that the commentary of the proud, old Cleveland Plain Dealer, in its editorial of February 12, 1970, well describes Tom Patton's message: "Challenge to Eagle Class of 1969":

PATTON: BUILD, DON'T DESPAIR

"Despite the turbulent times in which we live, there has never been a time when opportunities were as great as they are today."

"This America of ours is not the decadent and outmoded country that radicals and militants picture it to be."

"Changing times present new problems that must be dealt with and solved satisfactorily . . . They are not going to be solved by people who condemn society, who run away from it to escape into the realms of drug culture, who ridicule the values of hard work, dedication, sacrifice and teamwork."

"I urge you not to despair . . . Be of good cheer as you live and work in the knowledge that men of good will with faith in their hearts have . . . resolved problems, build and expand on what they have done."

These are excerpts from a brief address made by Thomas F. Patton at an Eagle Scout recognition ceremony at Severance Hall. If they are not precisely "words to live

by" they serve admirably to remind young people of the real value of straight out virtues.

Without flag-waving, without preaching, Patton—board chairman of Republic Steel Corp.—finished off the current picture of the United States as it is, presenting a side of the nation that often is obscured by news of social ferment.

Patton told the scouts that the "opportunities for ambitious people who want to assume responsibility and get ahead" are virtually limitless. American business thirsts for bright young men with initiative, ability, and integrity. He regretted that some young people use the imperfections of the world about them as an excuse to turn their backs on society.

Patton was no voice of doom. Nor was he Pollyanna. Simply he stated facts, admitted society's shortcomings but pointed out each new generation in years past has faced and overcome problems that seemed to be insurmountable.

The message was brief but clear, temperate but compelling. The best is yet to be—if young people are wise enough to grasp opportunity. And this is something that can—and should—be said again and again.

Now, Thomas F. Patton's "Challenge to Eagle Class of 1969" follows:

MESSAGE

Eagle Scouts, Parents, Fellow Scouters, and Guests: I appreciate deeply the honor and privilege of addressing you on this very important and happy occasion. And I want to tell you how grateful I am to have been the sponsor of this latest class of Eagle Scouts.

You young men who have just attained the rank of Eagle have reached a milestone in the course of your personal development. For your dedication and your exceptional accomplishments as a Scout, you are to be congratulated. At the same time, congratulations are due your parents, your Scout leaders, and the Boy Scout organization for the encouragement and the opportunities they have provided you. Just as we are all proud of you, I'm sure you have reason to be very proud of them.

We in the adult world find inspiration in your successful achievement of this highest rank in Scouting. It indicates that despite the distractions of today's growing emphasis on leisure, on entertainment, and even on self-indulgence, there are still many young people directing their energies toward wholesome, constructive, and character-building activities. I doubt that there has ever been an age when our adult society has felt a greater need for the development of young people with two feet on the ground, with conviction in their hearts and good sense in their heads. These qualities you must possess in healthy measure, else you could not have become an Eagle. Believe me, they will be of immense value to you in whatever career you choose, whether you eventually become a doctor, a lawyer, a teacher, or an employee of a corporation or of government.

Despite the turbulent times in which we live, and about which I will have more to say later, there has never been a time when opportunities were as great as they are today. And from all indications, they're going to be even greater tomorrow when you Eagle Scouts will have finished school and will be embarking upon your careers. In the larger enterprises such as my own company, Republic Steel, the opportunities for ambitious people who want to assume responsibility and get ahead are virtually limitless. All large companies are literally thirsting today for bright young men with initiative, ability, integrity, and a determination to advance to positions of leadership.

Scouting, however, has done something more for you than simply develop qualities that will help launch you on a successful

career. It has cultivated an attitude of service to your country and to your fellow man in society. And that is fortunate because as we enter the Seventies, ferment pervades our society. We can see it, hear it, feel it. Dissent, crime, urban crises, drugs, poverty, campus revolt, the protection of our environment—all contribute to a feeling of frustration and disillusionment.

We are struggling in our country to maintain a healthy economy and a reasonable degree of social harmony in the face of racial unrest, tension in our cities, and considerable soul searching over the quality of modern life and our physical environment.

It is regrettable that today there are some young people—just a few years older than you—who are using the imperfections in the world about them as an excuse to turn their backs on society. They ridicule our concepts of morality and utterly flaunt our pleas for self-control.

Now, it is not wrong for people of any age to analyze and criticize society's norms and ways of doing things. Indeed, we would likely become a static nation if this were not constantly taking place. But what I find discouraging about the behavior and attitudes of some young people today is their complete disavowal of institutions and patterns of living that we have developed in America through centuries of struggle, work, debate, and thought.

This America of ours is not the decadent and outmoded country that radicals and militants picture it to be. It has given too much to man's progress and well-being to be judged decadent and outmoded. Those who advocate its overthrow are themselves immature and unwilling to accept the realities of life. But, of course, it has its imperfections and problems as, indeed, all men and institutions do. Changing times present new problems that must be dealt with and solved satisfactorily.

For example, what is going to happen to our cities if more and more people with adequate or better-than-average incomes move to suburbs and leave behind in the central cities the poorer, less resourceful, and less educated people?

How are we going to protect peaceful, law-abiding citizens against ever-increasing crimes?

What are we really going to be able to do about providing equality of educational opportunities in a society that continues to be racially segregated?

How are we going to solve the problem of air and stream pollution on a basis that will provide a pleasant environment and yet not destroy industries which provide employment, taxes, and much-needed goods for our economy?

Of course, I don't have the answers to these questions today, or to the serious problems they raise. But I do know they must be faced and must be solved.

Now what does all this have to do with Eagle Scouts? Well, if I know anything about human nature, I know that problems of this dimension are not going to be solved by people who condemn society, who run away from it to escape into the realms of drug culture and who ridicule the values of hard work, dedication, sacrifice, and teamwork. It's going to require the efforts of people with faith, keen minds, strong hearts, and healthy bodies—in other words, with the qualities that you young men have exhibited and have shown a willingness to develop through your efforts in the world of Scouting.

The task seems immense, I know, but I urge you not to despair. Each new generation of Americans in years past has faced problems that seemed to it to be insurmountable. Yet each such new generation produced men of character—men who became a part of a tradition of meeting problems head on and solving them in a manner that has

kept our nation on the pathway to progress. Your generation too will produce such leaders, and you and your fellow Eagle Scouts from all parts of the land will be among them. You will have almost limitless opportunity to apply your knowledge, your energies, and your dedication to the further improvement of our society and our country. Be worthy of the tradition of enterprise and adventure that has characterized the American people throughout their history. And be of good cheer as you live and work in the knowledge that men of good will with faith in their hearts have overcome obstacles, have resolved problems, and have made ours the greatest country the world has ever known. Build and expand upon what they have begun.

Congratulations on becoming an Eagle Scout. Bless you for your efforts. Good health and good luck in your journey through life.

DR. KARL APPLBAUM: GUEST CHAPLAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, it was my pleasure to have welcomed one of my constituents, and a beloved friend, Rabbi Karl Applbaum of Flushing, Queens, to the Chamber of the House of Representatives. Dr. Applbaum delivered the beautiful and inspiring opening prayer at the outset of today's session.

At this time may I indicate that this month of February, known in the Hebrew calendar as the month of Adar, is a very important date in the life of the Applbaums, and it is for this reason that the rabbi delivered the invocation today.

It was in the month of Adar 60 years ago that Rabbi Applbaum's father, the Senior Rabbi Emanuel Applbaum, obtained his supreme ordination; 25 years later Karl was ordained; then 25 years ago his brother Rabbi Sidney Applbaum was ordained; 18 years ago a brother Rabbi Martin L. Applbaum was ordained. All of the Applbaums are practicing rabbis and hold distinguished pulpits.

Indeed, Dr. Applbaum comes from a praiseworthy family of sons who have followed in their father's footsteps. Dr. Applbaum's brother, Sidney, is rabbi of Congregation Beth Judah; and his brother Martin Louis, is rabbi of Mitchell Gardens, both also in New York.

The rabbi also has a son, Capt. Joseph Applbaum, serving in the Army in Italy who also has devoted himself to God. Joseph, the third generation of Applbaums serving in the rabbinate, is Jewish chaplain of the Southern European Task Force.

Which brings me to another unique family honor. Karl and Joseph Applbaum are the only father and son rabbis serving the Armed Forces, and only one of two such father-son combinations presently serving as military chaplains.

But after devoting 25 years as a chaplain in the U.S. Army Reserve, this month the learned spiritual leader will mark his retirement from this valuable public service.

Over the years, Rabbi Applbaum has also served in many patriotic organizations promoting the values and goals of the Armed Forces. For instance he has

been national chaplain of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States in addition to holding many local positions in that group; has served with distinction in many capacities in the Association of the U.S. Army; and he has been a leader of the U.S. Jewish War Veterans.

Dr. Applbaum has the unusual distinction of also being a practicing lawyer, having argued cases before the U.S. Supreme Court as well as the Federal district court for the southern and eastern districts.

From these twin vantage points—the pulpit and the court—he has lent his talents to varied endeavors in his quest to better life in our community.

For instance, he is chairman of the Queens Civic Improvement Council, served many years as special New York State deputy attorney general for policing election frauds, has advised New York's social workers, and has been active in such community groups as the B'nai B'rith, Knights of Pythias, and the Zionist organization of the United States.

Somehow, Dr. Applbaum finds time for other activities too. For instance he is active in the American Legion, a member of the board of governors of the National Information Bureau of Jewish Life, and a member of the board of governors of the J. F. K. Library for Minorities.

Dr. Applbaum has also been honored to be received by Pope John XXIII in 1959, and more recently, Pope Paul VI in 1968.

The latter visit followed a tour of Israel, after which Dr. Applbaum commented:

A great change has taken place in the last year. The holy places in Jerusalem have all been rehabilitated under the Israeli government. And the land of the Bible is blooming again with milk and honey.

Rabbi Applbaum was born 60 years ago in a small town in Hungary, now Rumania, to Rabbi Emanuel and Goldie Eckstein, a descendant on both sides of the family from a long line of distinguished rabbis.

In 1920 when the Rumanians took over the town where the Appelbaums lived, at that time, the family emigrated to the United States. Then began a long struggle for the Applbaums. The senior Rabbi Applbaum served in the towns of Glassport, McKeesport, Bentleyville—all in Pennsylvania, before the family moved to New York City in 1930.

Rabbi Applbaum is married to the former Helen Siegel, a graduate of Brooklyn College who is presently on the staff of the district attorney's office in Queens County. In addition to their son Joseph, the Applbaums have two daughters, Elaine Claire and Florence Rene, both married.

To cap Dr. Applbaum's life-long service to God and his community, earlier this month the U.S. Army Reserve honored him with the Legion of Merit. With such a distinguished background to his credit, it certainly was a pleasure to have welcomed Dr. Applbaum as guest chaplain in the House of Representatives today.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to welcome as our guest chaplain in the House of Representatives today the distinguished associate of the Avenue M Jewish Center in Brooklyn, N.Y., Dr. Karl Applbaum.

Dr. Applbaum has made extensive contributions in the rabbinate for the past 35 years, and he has served as a chaplain in the Army Reserves for 25 of those years. Beyond his valuable efforts in the spiritual field, he occupies a most prominent position in the intellectual community, holding doctorates in philosophy and juridical science.

Few communities can boast of a more erudite citizen who participates so freely, and so effectively, in the area of human interests.

We are proud to have this distinguished American in our Chamber today to offer our invocation.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, we are honored today by the presence of a most distinguished gentleman, Rabbi Dr. Karl Applbaum, who is celebrating his 35th anniversary in the rabbinate this month. His invocation today was truly inspirational to the Members of Congress and we thank him for honoring us with his thoughtful prayers.

Rabbi Applbaum is the spiritual leader of the Avenue M Jewish Center in Brooklyn and his work is widely known in the community. He shares the pulpit with his father, the senior rabbi of the congregation who this month is celebrating his 65th anniversary in the rabbinate.

Rabbi Applbaum served with distinction for 25 years as a chaplain in the Army Reserve and only recently retired. As a reserve officer I frequently heard and saw firsthand the important work of this remarkable man.

Rabbi Applbaum is further distinguished by also being a practicing lawyer who has argued cases before the U.S. Supreme Court.

It will occur to many that the Congress has honored Dr. Applbaum by inviting his invocation today. It is Rabbi Applbaum who honors us by his presence here today, and by his lifetime of selfless dedication to God and to man.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to welcome wholeheartedly a most distinguished member of the Jewish clergy, Dr. Karl Applbaum, who has today delivered a most inspiring invocation to this body.

Dr. Applbaum, associated with the Avenue M Jewish Center in Brooklyn, N.Y., possesses a reputation and stature known and respected throughout our Nation. He has served both God and country, as a rabbi, as a chaplain in the U.S. Army during World War II, and as a member of the Reserve since his separation from active duty.

It is not too often that one learns of a member of the clergy who is active outside the confines of his religious affiliations. But Dr. Applbaum is most active in several veterans organizations including the American Legion and the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, several professional organizations and fraternal organizations. Dr. Applbaum delivered the invocations in this body on the occasion of the fourth and 15th an-

niversaries of the establishment of the State of Israel. On those occasions those of us who had the pleasure of listening to him were most favorably impressed. We are again today gratified by his remarks and are appreciative of the efforts of our colleague, the Honorable SEYMOUR HALPERN in making possible his appearance.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, it was with great pride and feeling that I listened to Dr. Karl Applbaum deliver the invocation at the opening of today's session.

Dr. Karl Applbaum has had a long and distinguished career as a religious and community leader in Brooklyn. He founded the Avenue M Jewish Center with his father in 1938, and has served as its rabbi since that time.

Rabbi Applbaum is both the father and the son of rabbis. Clearly, the community involvement of the Applbaum family has spanned the generations. This distinguished family has garnered the admiration and respect of the communities it has served.

Rabbi Applbaum was educated in New York. He has been awarded a bachelor of science, a master of science, a master of arts, a bachelor of laws, and a doctorate in judicial science. In addition, he is a certified New York State social worker and licensed teacher.

In World War II, the rabbi served as a chaplain in the U.S. Army, and he is presently chaplain of the 307th General Hospital with the rank of lieutenant colonel in the Reserves.

I hope that Dr. Applbaum will address this Congress in future sessions and will continue in his dedicated service to the citizens of Brooklyn.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I know all the Members of the House join our colleague, Congressman HALPERN, in welcoming Rabbi Karl Applbaum, who is celebrating his 35th anniversary in the rabbinate this month, and who delivered this morning's invocation.

Dr. Applbaum is the spiritual leader of the Avenue M Jewish Center in Brooklyn, where he has shared the pulpit for many years with his father—the senior rabbi of the congregation, who is celebrating his 65th year in the rabbinate.

In addition to his rabbinical duties, Rabbi Applbaum has the unique distinction of also having a legal career. He has argued cases, as a practicing lawyer, before the U.S. Supreme Court and the Federal district court for the southern and eastern districts of New York.

Another aspect of his commitment to his fellow men is reflected in his many community activities. He is chairman of the Queens Civic Improvement Council. He served for many years as a special New York State deputy attorney general for overseeing elections.

His additional activities include advising and counseling New York social workers, the B'nai B'rith, the American Legion, and Jewish War Veterans.

Rabbi Applbaum recently retired as chaplain in the U.S. Army Reserve, in which he served for 25 years. As a reward for his service, the Army Reserve honored Rabbi Applbaum with its Legion of Merit.

I congratulate Rabbi Applbaum upon his career of service to his religion and to his community.

It was an honor having him here today, and I am sure he will continue to distinguish himself as a man concerned with serving his country and his faith.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to note that today's invocation was given by Rabbi Dr. Karl Applbaum, a prominent member of the American rabbinate. Dr. Applbaum has devoted his boundless energy and unique gifts in achieving distinction as a rabbi, attorney, military chaplain, social worker, and teacher. This year marks his 35th year as a rabbi, while his father Rabbi Emanuel Applbaum is observing his 60th year in the rabbinate, and his son Joseph is completing 4 years as an Army chaplain.

In addition to his exceptional professional accomplishments, Rabbi Applbaum is a leader in a host of veterans organizations where the selfless devotion of his time and talents have made significant contributions to the success and development of these organizations. It is an honor to welcome Rabbi Applbaum to the House of Representatives, and to personally extend my gratitude and recognition of his many contributions to the welfare of our Nation and his dedication to the ideals which have made this Nation great.

Rabbi Applbaum is a vice president of the National Information Bureau for Jewish Life, of which our distinguished colleague from New York, the Honorable LEONARD FARBSTEIN, is the honorary national president. I wish to extend my greetings to Rabbi Applbaum and to welcome him to our Nation's Capital.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of Dr. Rabbi Applbaum.

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

There was no objection.

WHO NEEDS THE NEWSPAPER PRESERVATION ACT? HAWAII DOES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 1970, in a lengthy floor speech, entitled "The Newspaper Preservation Act: Who Needs It?" the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MACGREGOR) attacked the proposed Newspaper Preservation Act. Regrettably, he had not advised any of the sponsors of this legislation—of which there are over 100 in the House, myself included—that he was going to make this statement. I say this is regrettable, because I would have availed myself of the opportunity to question him directly on

certain statements he made, in order to keep the issue from being clouded. I have informed the gentleman about this special order today, but he regretted his inability to be present.

The attack was made on S. 1520, a bill which passed the Senate by a vote of 64 to 13. Reference was also made to the companion bills in the House, presumably including H.R. 279, the Newspaper Preservation Act, which I have introduced.

I rise now to reply to the gentleman's arguments, by offering facts rather than hypotheses, and in the hope that I might convince my colleagues that the Newspaper Preservation Act is essential not only to the people of Hawaii, but also to the Nation as a whole.

Let me state at the outset that we in Honolulu have two excellent newspapers, the Honolulu Star-Bulletin and the Honolulu Advertiser. Each has its own rather independent point of view—the Star-Bulletin is basically conservative, and Republican oriented, while the Advertiser is inclined to be liberal, with Democratic leanings. The important point is that each has its own editorial voice, and these two papers are continuing a long-standing competition in news and editorial views.

About 10 years ago, however, it looked as though one voice, that of the Advertiser, was about to be stilled. The Advertiser had had several consecutive years of serious financial losses, and it was becoming clear that the community was unable to support two commercially competing daily newspapers. There was competition for advertising revenue from radio, television, magazines, and weekly shopper papers. The Star-Bulletin could have bought out the Advertiser, but that solution was unsatisfactory to both publishers. Instead, with the knowledge of the Department of Justice, which investigated the situation, the two papers entered into a joint business operating arrangement, tantamount to a commercial merger, while maintaining separate and competing news and editorial voices. Since 1933, newspapers in some 20 cities have entered into like arrangements, without any complaint from the Justice Department or the Federal Trade Commission.

For the people of Hawaii, the joint operating arrangement was a wonderful solution to the economic problem which faced the two newspapers, for as a consequence: there was first, continued and increased employment at both papers, second, advertising rates were lowered, and third, a real competition in ideas and views, which is so important to the public, followed.

In direct answer to the gentleman's question, "The Newspaper Preservation Act, Who Needs It?" Let me assure him that Hawaii needs it.

The gentleman suggests that because of the court's decision in the Tucson case, which imposed a plan on the newspapers in that city, the newspapers in 21 other cities with joint operating arrangements, including Honolulu, have nothing more to worry about, and there is no longer a need for legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Tucson plan is truly remarkable. While allowing some of the

cost-saving programs which have been carried on for 30 years, the court now insists that there be three advertising departments, in place of the one that had sufficed in the past, and three circulation departments, instead of one. Obviously the court's plan increases costs. A remarkable feature of the imposed plan is that the two papers are allowed a joint operating arrangement on Sundays but not on weekdays—the apparent rationale being that it is all right to sin on the Sabbath but not on weekdays.

Mr. Speaker, it is just possible that the Tucson papers will be able to survive under the court's plan—not prosper, but survive—because the two papers happened to be about equal in circulation figures. They could just about divide costs and profits right down the middle. However, if the Tucson plan were imposed in Honolulu, where one paper has a much larger circulation than the other, the paper with the lesser circulation would immediately begin operating in the red and not be able to survive. The city would consequently be reduced to just one editorial voice.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Hawaii and of this Nation deserve something better than the Tucson plan. Knowing what it is to have divergent editorial voices, my people at least will reject the Tucson plan. Who needs the Newspaper Preservation Act? Honolulu needs it. And so do 21 other cities in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that the gentleman from Minnesota has no joint newspaper operating arrangements in his own State. In fact, there is no city in all of Minnesota with two different newspaper editorial voices. Three cities in Minnesota have morning and evening papers—but in each, both morning and evening papers are owned by one company. In Minneapolis, the Cowles family owns the morning and evening papers. In St. Paul, the Ridder family owns both papers, just as it owns both papers in Duluth. These are all excellent papers, parts of powerful chains, and I find no fault in them. In fact, the Newspaper Preservation Act which I propose seeks only to give to the two little publishers in Honolulu the same legal recognition as the one owner has in Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth.

That is the crux of the issue—to extend to the owners of two separate papers the same operating arrangements, a commercial merger, now enjoyed by a single owner of two papers. And, by so doing, preserving two separate voices.

Mr. Speaker, I would like briefly to refute a couple of other arguments made by the gentleman. He notes that the Department of Commerce supports the bill, but that the Justice Department opposes it. What the gentleman failed to note is that the administration favors the bill.

The suggestion that this bill might abridge the freedom of the press is a specious argument. To the contrary, the very intent of the bill is to preserve newspapers which would otherwise fail and to keep alive free editorial voices which would otherwise be silenced. In refutation of the gentleman's argument that the proposed legislation would stifle the entry

of any new newspaper, I would suggest that the gentleman inquire of the Cowles family in Minneapolis about their experience with the Suffolk Sun in Nassau County, N.Y. The records show that this most knowledgeable publishing group lost millions of dollars in attempting to start up a new paper, and recently gave up the effort. The unfortunate fact is that there has been no successful new entry of a newspaper in a major metropolitan area in over 40 years. It appears that it just cannot be done. The only hope of multinewspaper cities is to preserve existing newspapers, which my bill proposes to do.

Finally, the gentleman states that many papers oppose this bill. I am aware that the National Newspaper Association is against the bill—and the NNA does have thousands of members, including weeklies, dailies, and even joint operating newspapers. I question the position of the NNA as spokesman for all of its members, since its members have not voted or taken a position on S. 1520 or H.R. 279. The opposition has been voiced only by the board of directors of this group.

The Newspaper Preservation Act is endorsed by the American Newspaper Publishers Association, speaking for the vast majority of our dailies, and by a lot of prestigious papers across this Nation.

Besides, Mr. Speaker, the proposed legislation is supported in Hawaii by every labor union involved by the advertisers, the business and professional organizations, the State and county governments, and many civic clubs and organizations.

Who needs the Newspaper Preservation Act? We who believe in freedom of the press all do.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Hawaii on his excellent statement. I endorse it fully. Let me add that the people of Nashville, Knoxville, and Bristol, all in Tennessee, need the Newspaper Preservation Act, because each of these cities has enjoyed the benefits of competitive news and editorial voices through joint newspaper operating arrangements for a good many years. The arrangement in Nashville dates back to 1936, Bristol to 1950, and Knoxville to 1957. In each city, the two papers entered into a joint operating arrangement because at least one was failing. It is abundantly clear that the rather strange plan ordered by the Tucson court would have no other result than again causing one of the papers in each joint arrangement to return posthaste to its failing status. What would this accomplish? It would reduce each city to just one editorial voice—and that includes my home of Nashville, the capital of the great State of Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, it seems inconceivable to me to have a major seat of government without differing news and editorial opinions. This is really essential to good government. Nashville is blessed with real editorial competition between the Banner and the Tennessean. It would be a terrible thing if either of these fine newspaper voices were to die.

Mr. Speaker, this is why I say that Tennessee needs the Newspaper Preservation Act. Accounting studies show that these papers could not compete commercially, and the Tucson plan would be a travesty.

I just cannot understand how the gentleman from Minnesota can rationalize denying to Nashville, Knoxville, and Bristol the same rights as are now enjoyed in Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth. All we seek is parity with the one-owner situations, and nothing more.

There is one further point I would like to make. In Chattanooga, Tenn., the two papers that were in a joint operating arrangement split apart. It is common knowledge that both began losing money. Believe me, the people of Chattanooga have not benefited from this. Moreover, in the last few days the Department of Justice has entered the Chattanooga situation, accusing the Times and Post of unlawful operations in ratemaking activities. The Justice Department stated that the Times and Post had been losing money for over 3 years—and this was not denied by the papers. The Times and Post accepted a consent decree, the direct results of which are the closing down of the Post, and an increase in advertising and circulation rates by the Times. If further proof is needed to demonstrate that enactment of the Newspaper Preservation Act is in the public interest—the situation in Chattanooga provides such proof.

The account of the Justice Department's action and the reaction by the Times and Post of Chattanooga is reported in the Wall Street Journal's February 24, 1970, edition and I include the Journal's story at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 25, 1970]
CHATTANOOGA POST STOPS PRINTING AFTER U.S. SUIT—NEWSPAPER MONOPOLY SCHEME CHARGED; CONSENT DECREE PROVIDES FOR RATE RISES—BELOW-COST OPERATION CITED

The Chattanooga Post suspended publication, effective today, and its publisher agreed to a consent decree to settle an antitrust suit that charged it attempted to monopolize the daily newspaper business in Chattanooga.

The suit and the proposed consent decree were simultaneously filed in the U.S. district court at Chattanooga by the Justice Department.

The Chattanooga Post was published by the Times Printing Co. The majority stockholder in Times Printing is a trust established under the will of Adolph S. Ochs, the late publisher of the New York Times.

Mrs. Ruth S. Golden, president and publisher of Times Printing, said the Chattanooga Times and the New York Times are "mutually owned and wholly independent. There is no interchange of personnel and finances, but there is an overlapping membership on the board of directors." Both newspapers, she said, are "principally" owned by the Ochs Trust.

The consent decree provides substantial increases in advertising rates of the Chattanooga Times and an increase in the paper's subscription rates.

The suit charged that Times Printing began the Post and took various other actions, in an attempt to monopolize the Chattanooga newspaper business, after a decision in 1966 by its competitor, the Chattanooga News-Free Press, to sever certain joint operations.

The suit said that between May 5, 1942, and Aug. 27, 1966, the Chattanooga Times and the News-Free Press were parties to a joint operating agreement under which their commercial operations were conducted jointly while their news and editorial departments remained separate. The agreement, according to the Justice Department, was similar to one between two Tucson, Ariz., newspapers that the Supreme Court last year held in violation of Federal antitrust laws.

While the agreement was in effect, the Times was published mornings and Sunday and the News-Free Press was published evenings, the suit said. Early in 1964, it continued, the News-Free Press notified the Times it intended to terminate the agreement and resume separate and competitive publication.

The two papers were separated on Aug. 27, 1966, and Times Printing then began to publish its evening paper, the Post. The News-Free Press also began publication of a Sunday edition, the suit said.

The suit charged that publication of the Post "was commenced and continued for the sole purpose of eliminating the Free Press as a competitor." It also alleged that Times Printing attempted to monopolize the newspaper business in Chattanooga by intentionally operating at below its costs; by adopting unreasonably low advertising and circulation rates and by requiring combination purchases of classified advertising space in the Times and Post.

The consent decree is to become final on court approval in 30 days.

Under it, the Times also agreed to raise advertising rates in the morning Times to no less than 80% of those charged by the News-Free press for six months and then to raise the rates to the equivalent of the News-Free Press for 30 months.

Subscription rates will be raised to at least 90% of the current News-Free Press rates and maintained there at least three years.

In consenting to the suit, the Times denied any wrongdoing. "The Times did not and does not agree with the department's conclusions or with this characterization of its competitive actions," a statement from Mrs. Golden said. "However, we could only prove the correctness of our position in lengthy and expensive litigation with the Government.

"Consequently, we have reluctantly decided, as have many businesses before us, to agree to a consent decree as the only alternative to such litigation."

A spokesman for the Times said the Government charged that it has had substantial losses over the last three years. "We don't deny that," he said. He added that differences in advertising rates between the papers result from the News-Free Press raising rates and the Times holding the line.

He said that the afternoon paper, which ceased publication after the Tuesday edition, shared the same building and printing facilities as the Times. No layoffs have been announced, he said.

The decree further provides that, should Times Printing resume publication of an evening paper, it will be subject to certain additional restrictions. These include a ban on selling combination advertising in the morning and evening papers at rates lower than each regular rate and a ban on any requirement that advertisers, to buy space in one paper, buy space in both.

Mr. Speaker, the Newspaper Preservation Act is bipartisan, introduced by many Members on both sides of the aisle. I am very pleased to see that this administration, which opposes media concentration, supports this bill in order to preserve separate editorial voices. I am sure the bill will receive full support from Members of both parties, and pass the House of Representatives.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROONEY of New York). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

VETERANS' MONTHLY EDUCATION AND TRAINING ALLOWANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROONEY of New York). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BUSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, on August 4, 1969, the House passed H.R. 11959 calling for a 27-percent increase in the monthly education and training allowance to eligible veterans. October 23, 1969, the Senate passed similar legislation calling for a 46-percent increase in benefits. The House concurred with the Senate amendment, agreed to a 30.8-percent increase on December 18, 1969, and sent the bill to the Senate for further consideration.

Since that time we have all hoped that an acceptable bill would be agreed upon before the midsemester school term began. But the conference remained blocked. The House managers, Mr. Speaker, have been willing to cooperate. They have even produced a vote approving an increase in benefits over the original House-passed bill. These men have acted in good faith and have represented the views of this body well.

While these veterans are being denied an increase in benefits they need so badly because of the effect inflation has had on education, all we have heard from a majority of the managers of the other body is that "They will not compromise." Our legislative system, Mr. Speaker, was founded on compromise. The House and the Senate were designed to represent varying interests. Since our legislative branch was established the representatives of both Houses have sat down and ironed out their differences. Together they have worked for the best interests of the whole country.

But the kind of conference where one side is unwilling to cooperate with the other and attempts to impose its will on the other body is not in the best interests of the Nation nor in the best tradition of the Congress. I think Chairman TEAGUE and the other House managers should be commended by this body for the fine work they have been doing in the conference and the spirit of cooperation and genuine concern for these veterans they have brought to it.

Sometimes one wonders whether some of the Senators want a fair bill or whether they want to make political hay. All I know is that the veterans are the losers in all of this.

NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF BUSINESSMEN—A GOOD LABOR PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in the Appropriations Committee we are now going over the largest budget in the history of these United States, and everywhere in that budget it seems to spell an increased reliance on the Federal Government to solve the problems of this country.

There is, however, one program undertaken by private industry as a cooperative venture with the Federal Government which is aimed at solving the unemployment problem in this country and, in turn, attempts to solve the problem of the many jobs that lie untaken because of the lack of skilled workers. That program is the National Alliance of Businessmen's Job Opportunities in the Business Sector—or as it is more commonly called, the jobs program.

Nationally, the program has been very successful. The original goals set by the program, calling for 100,000 jobs for the hard-core disadvantaged, were exceeded by 50 percent the first year, and are running ahead of expectations this year. Of the 378,000 persons hired since July 1968, when the program was initiated, some 200,000 are still on the job.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a conservative estimate. It does not include those who have left the firm with which they were originally employed to take a similar job with another firm. Nor does it include those who have gone on to other training positions to acquire even better skills. It is a remarkable figure considering the type employee involved in this program. At the same time it reveals the validity of a program that not only brings employer and employee together, but also continues to counsel with the hard-core employee until he is well trained and in reasonably stable employment.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, there are two ways an employer may become involved in the NAB-JOBS program. One is for the employer to provide all the jobs and counseling himself. But the other and more popular method is to contract with a reputable firm that is equipped to act as a personnel office in bringing the employee and employer together and as a counselor in working with the employee until he can really make it on his own.

In Mobile, which is in the First District of Alabama, some 25 companies have pledged jobs to the program, 409 jobs have been approved and funded via the second method, that is Department of Labor contracts, 15 jobs have been pledged without contracts, 306 trainees have been hired, and total dollar value of the program in the Mobile area is \$971,000.

This program, if properly utilized, can and will do much to alleviate unemployment, reduce welfare expenditures, and have a significant impact through decreasing social unrest.

Mr. Speaker, it works because there

is someone who will take an interest in a worker after he is hired. Some employment programs help hard-core unemployed persons get a job, but there is no followthrough. This program stays with him, helps him over the rough spots and consequently the retention rate is something approaching 76 percent when operating under contract. The program works well even for those not using the contract approach, but the retention rate drops to about 53 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I am enthusiastic about this program and I hope more employers will begin to participate in it.

THE GATES COMMISSION ON AN ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMED FORCE—PART II, CHAPTER 3

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, part II of the Commission report presents the pertinent evidence gathered during its inquiry and the analysis underlying its recommendations which form the essential background of the Commission's findings.

Chapter 3 of the report deals with one of the more complicated arguments in support of the Volunteer Army concept—the tax of conscription. It is an issue few people have explored in depth, but the Commission spent a great deal of time developing this point because it is this cost to the individual soldier and to society in general which is very real but never gets into the accounting figures.

Chapter 3 which follows bears careful reading:

CHAPTER 3: CONSCRIPTION IS A TAX

Any government has essentially two ways of accomplishing an objective whether it be building an interstate highway system or raising an army. It can expropriate the required tools and compel construction men and others to work until the job is finished or it can purchase the goods and manpower necessary to complete the job. Under the first alternative, only the persons who own the property seized or who render compulsory or housing project. They pay a tax to finance the project, albeit a tax-in-kind. Under the second alternative, the cost of the necessary goods and services is borne by the general public through taxes raised to finance the project.

Conscription is like the first alternative—a tax-in-kind. A mixed force of volunteers and conscripts contains first-term servicemen of three types—(1) draftees (2) draft-induced volunteers and (3) true volunteers. Draftees and draft-induced volunteers in such a force are coerced into serving at levels of compensation below what would be required to induce them to volunteer. They are, in short, underpaid. This underpayment is a form of taxation. Over 200 years ago, Benjamin Franklin, in commenting on a judicial opinion concerning the legality of impressment of American merchant seamen, recognized the heart of the issue, and even estimated the hidden tax. He wrote:

"But if, as I suppose is often the case, the sailor who is pressed and obliged to serve for the defense of this trade at the rate of 25s. a month, could have £3.15s. in the merchant's service, you take from him 50s. a month; and if you have 100,000 in your

service, you rob that honest part of society and their poor families of £250,000. per month, or three millions a year, and at the same time oblige them to hazard their lives in fighting for the defence of your trade; to the defence of which all ought indeed to contribute, (and sailors among the rest) in proportion to their profits by it; but this three millions is more than their share, if they did not pay with their persons; and when you force that, methinks you should excuse the other.

"But it may be said, to give the king's seamen merchant's wages would cost the nation too much, and call for more taxes. The question then will amount to this; whether it be just in a community, that the richer part should compel the poorer to fight for them and their properties for such wages as they think fit to allow, and punish them if they refuse? Our author tells us it is legal. I have not law enough to dispute his authority, but I cannot persuade myself it is equitable."

The levy of taxes-in-kind is not a modern innovation. Such taxes have existed throughout history. The impressment to which Benjamin Franklin objected is an example. Also, it was common practice in the Middle Ages to require specific service of citizens in farming, construction, defense and other activities. Traditionally, however, in the United States, taxes-in-kind have been rejected for three reasons. First, they deprive individuals of their freedom to pursue their careers where and how they choose—in essence their right to liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Second, they are often accompanied by serious inequities; i.e., a few people are forced to bear the burden of accomplishing a task for the general good of the government and its citizens. Third, they tend to conceal taxes and government expenditures so that both the general public and public officials are misinformed as to the costs of government services.

Under conscription, each inductee and reluctant volunteer is compelled to render services to the government. He is required to pay a tax—a tax paid (and collected) in kind rather than cash—but the form of the payment does not alter the substance of the relationship. The amount of the tax is the difference between the pay that the inductee or reluctant volunteer actually receives as a first-term serviceman and the pay that would be required to induce him to enlist. Even true volunteers who serve in a mixed force are paid less than they would receive in a volunteer force. In that sense, they too are taxed by conscription.

Prevailing government accounting practices do not recognize taxes paid in kind. Therefore, the tax on first-term servicemen never gets recorded in the budget either as revenue or as expenditure. In an all-volunteer force, the additional military compensation will be paid in cash or other benefits, and the taxes to make those payments will be collected in cash. Recorded budget expenditures will have to be increased to reflect these payments. This is the source of the budget "increase" we have estimated for an all-volunteer force. If current government accounting practices fully reflected revenues and expenditures, whether in money or in kind, there would be not a budget increase, but a budget decrease.

The real significance of the larger recorded budget for an all-volunteer force is the adjustment of the burden of defense costs. What appears on the surface to be an increase in expenditures is actually a shift in the tax burden from first-term servicemen to taxpayers at large. If government accounts reflected taxes-in-kind, tax revenues from first-term servicemen would go down with the inauguration of an all-volunteer armed force, and (assuming a balanced budget) tax revenues from the general public would go up.

This shift in tax burden lies at the heart of resistance on "cost" grounds to an all-volunteer armed force. Indeed, this shift in tax burden explains how conscription gets enacted in the first place. In a political democracy conscription offers the general public an opportunity to impose a disproportionate share of defense costs on a minority of the population.

We have made estimates of the amount of the tax-in-kind imposed on draftees and draft-induced enlistees for the period immediately prior to Vietnam, adjusted to reflect changes in civilian and military compensation through 1969. The tax can be separated into two components: first, the financial loss suffered by draftees and draft-induced enlistees because their total military compensation (including veterans benefits) falls short of the income they would have earned in civilian life; and second, the additional burden measured by the excess of military over civilian compensation that would be required to induce these same individuals to become true volunteers. We estimate that the financial loss due to the first of these, the difference between military compensation and potential civilian earnings, was \$1.5 billion for draftees or draft-induced volunteers in the pre-Vietnam force. To induce these same individuals to become true volunteers we estimate would have required an additional \$500 million. Thus the total implicit tax on draftees and draft-induced volunteers was \$2.0 billion.

This implies an average tax rate of 48 percent of the income that draftees and draft-induced enlistees would have earned in civilian life. Taking into account the personal income tax they paid, their total tax rate was 51 percent. In 1967, the average personal income tax paid by all persons whose gross earnings were equal to the amount that would have been earned by draftees and draft-induced enlistees as civilians, was less than 10 percent of that gross income. Since draftees and draft-induced enlistees have fewer than the average number of dependents, it is estimated that they would have paid perhaps as much as 15 percent of their gross income in personal income tax. Hence, draftees and draft-induced enlistees are bearing a tax burden over three times that of comparable civilians.

This concept of the tax does not include the income loss suffered by true volunteers whose military compensation is held below the level which would be required to maintain an all-volunteer force, nor does it include the amount by which all-volunteer pay rates would exceed the pay levels at which some of the current draftees and draft-induced enlistees would enter on a voluntary basis. The sum of these two amounts has been estimated at \$1.25 billion annually, again for the period immediately prior to Vietnam.

As is pointed out in detail later in this chapter, the concept of the implicit tax considered above does not fully encompass the costs of conscription. Prospective inductees also incur costs in their efforts to escape conscription—costs which manifest themselves in a variety of ways such as additional college attendance, movement into occupations which carry deferments, immigration, etc. Indirect evidence suggests that these costs may be 1.5 times the implicit tax, or about \$3.0 billion. They can be viewed as the cost of collecting the implicit tax. Thus for each \$1.00 of tax-in-kind collected, an average of \$2.50 is foregone by the public. Quite apart from considerations of equity and freedom, this feature of conscription is enough to call it into question.

The fact that conscription imposes a tax is not in itself immoral and undesirable. Taxes are required to enable government to exist. What is of questionable morality is the discriminatory form that this implicit

tax takes; and even more, the abridgement of individual freedom that is involved in collecting it.

The tax is discriminatory because the first-term servicemen who pay it constitute a small proportion of the total population. During the next decade the number of males reaching age 19 each year will average 2.2 million. To maintain a stable mixed force of 2.5 million men at present relative military/civilian pay levels, draft calls will average about 100,000 per year. We estimate that draft-induced enlistments might be 75,000 per year. Therefore the draftees and draft-induced-enlistees paying the tax-in-kind will represent only 8 percent of the male population reaching age 19 each year.

The extent of the discrimination resulting from conscription depends on the proportion of the population forced to serve, and on the level of compensation provided to those who serve. When a large fraction of the population is conscripted as it was, for example, in World War II, the tax is levied on a larger fraction of the population. Even then, however, the discrimination is by no means eliminated. Not everyone eligible to serve does so. Moreover, such wars do not occur every generation, hence some generations never pay though they benefit from the defense provided by others. Even in World War II, the 16.4 million men who served in the armed forces represented only 12 percent of the total population, 17 percent of the adult population and 56 percent of the adult male population between 18 and 45.

Defenders of conscription often argue that every young person has the duty to serve his country. The above discussion makes it clear that the real question is not whether young people have such a duty, but whether that duty does not extend to the entire populace. Is it right and proper that a large tax be confined to a small fraction of our young able-bodied males in order to relieve taxpayers in general from having to pay higher taxes?

In addition to being discriminatory, conscription as a tax is also generally regressive, falling on individuals whose income is low. The amount of benefits in the form of defense that individuals receive as a consequence of the tax is not related to the amount of tax they pay. Finally, and most importantly, the tax requires payment in kind, rather than money, and the payment in kind takes the form of involuntary service.

It is unlikely that any Congressman would ever propose enactment of a general tax of the kind now imposed by the draft. If one ever were proposed, it would have little chance of being approved by Congress. If approved by Congress, it is hard to imagine that it would be held constitutional by the courts. This is a hidden tax which persists only because it is obscure. No tax is perfect, of course, but it is hard to imagine a means of imposing the cost of defense, or any other Government activity for that matter, more in conflict with accepted standards of justice, equality and freedom in the United States.

THE COST OF AN ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE

The larger budget required to sustain an all-volunteer armed force is frequently referred to as the "cost" of such a force. We have deliberately refrained from using that language. We have done so in order to stress the difference between "costs" on the one hand and "budget expenditures" on the other. Budget expenditures need not correctly reflect costs. Indeed, as we have indicated above, government accounting practices do not recognize the expenditure in kind implicit in conscription. To that extent the cost of a mixed voluntary/conscript force is consistently understated in the

budget. But the cost of such a force is also understated in other ways.

When the hidden costs of conscription are fully recognized, the cost of an all-volunteer armed force is unquestionably less than the cost of a force of equal size and quality manned wholly or partly through conscription. The all-volunteer costs are lower for four reasons.

1. Conscription leads to low re-enlistment rates among first-term servicemen, thereby increasing turnover rates. Most inductees and draft-induced volunteers are not seriously interested in careers in the military. First-term re-enlistment rates for inductees pre-Vietnam were about one-fourth as high as for enlistees. In an all-volunteer force, first-term re-enlistment rates will be higher than those currently experienced because those who enlist will be more likely to choose the military as a career. Moreover, the term of service for inductees is only two years while regular army enlistments are three years and Air Force and Navy enlistments are four years. With an all-volunteer force these longer terms of enlistment will also reduce turnover and the need for accessions.

Both factors will generate real cost savings. For a mixed voluntary/conscript force of 2.5 million men we estimate that annual first-term accessions in fiscal year 1977 to 1979 would have to be 452,000. For an all-volunteer force with equal effectiveness, accessions would be only 342,000, or 110,000 less. Lower accessions will mean a smaller training establishment; that is, fewer trainers, trainees and support personnel and less training equipment and facilities. We estimate this will reduce the cost of a stable 2.5 million man peacetime force by \$675 million per year.

In addition to the savings in training costs, there will also be savings in the number of personnel who are in a non-effective status because of transfers generated by high personnel turnover. An all-volunteer force will have fewer separations, hence fewer changes of status to accommodate separations. This also will result in cost savings. The number of servicemen in ineffective status will decline as will transportation and administrative costs. We estimate that the savings will be \$68 million per year for a stable peacetime force of 2.5 million men.

In our study we have recognized these particular cost reductions by appropriately reducing the required size of the forces. Thus, a mixed voluntary/conscript force of 2.5 million men is equated to an all-volunteer force of 2.44 million. The latter represents the same effective force as the former taking account of the savings in training and transients which we estimate will accrue.

2. Conscription induces the military services to use manpower inefficiently. They make manpower decisions on the basis of the costs as they perceive them, namely, those that are reflected in their budget. Because budget expenses significantly understate the cost of first-term servicemen, the services are led to use more of them than they otherwise would. This is not because they are profligate or inept. By minimizing the costs as they see them of meeting specific security requirements, they are behaving as the nation would want them to behave. The problem arises because conscription greatly understates these costs.

When military compensation is raised to a level consistent with an all-volunteer armed force, the services will find it desirable to economize on manpower. In particular, they will discover ways to substitute non-human resources for manpower in a wide variety of activities. They will find it desirable to mechanize tasks now performed manually, and to emphasize, even more than at present, durability, reliability and ease of maintenance

in the design of equipment and vehicles and in the construction of facilities. It would be a prodigious research effort to examine each activity for potential savings from such substitutions. Moreover, as a practical matter, there will be a long period of transition before the process of effecting such substitutions is completed. For these reasons we have not attempted to estimate the total savings that could result from labor-saving substitutions if the forces were all-volunteer.

We have, however, examined one area of potential substitutions; namely, that of using civilians instead of military personnel in particular positions. Conscription leads to the assignment of servicemen to some billets which could be filled by civilians at lower costs. If a civilian is hired, the Defense Department must pay the full cost thereof, but if a first-term serviceman is used the price is only his military compensation. An extensive study was conducted of specific billets where potential savings from such substitutions exist. These savings accrue because military training costs are reduced or because a civilian can be hired at a salary below the real cost of a serviceman performing the same task, that is, below the salary required to fill the position with a volunteer. We estimate that for a force of 2.5 million men, 117,000 civilians could be substituted for servicemen at a savings of perhaps \$100 million per year.

3. Conscription, whether by lottery or by Selective Service, is relatively insensitive to the alternative value of the draftee in the civilian economy and to his tastes for military employment. Thus, suppose a draftee or draft-induced volunteer is compelled to enter the service who would do so voluntarily only if he were offered \$8,000 per year. If there exists a true volunteer who would be equally productive in the military, prepared to enlist for \$6,000 per year, the difference of \$2,000 is an additional real cost imposed by the draft. The \$2,000 can reflect either a difference in the productivity of the two persons in the civilian economy, or differences in taste for military life. Whichever it is, the loss is a real cost (and a waste) in precisely the same sense as is any other cost.

4. Finally, there are many subtle costs imposed by conscription that are no less real for their subtlety. Their effects ramify throughout society, impinging on a variety of individual and institutional decisions.

The costs imposed on potential draftees are perhaps the most obvious. The draft erodes ideals of patriotism and service by alienating many of the young who bear the burden. American youths are raised in an atmosphere where freedom and justice are held dear. It is difficult for them to cope with a situation which falls far short of these ideals just as they enter adulthood. The draft undermines identification with society just at the age when young men begin to assume social responsibilities. It thwarts the natural desire of youths to commit themselves to society.

Many of the implicit costs of the draft arise out of the system of deferments and exemptions currently in effect, and out of the qualification requirements for military service. Young men distort their career and personal plans to take advantage of opportunities to postpone or avoid being drafted. They enter college when they otherwise would not. They stay in school longer than they otherwise would. They accept employment in positions they otherwise would not take. They marry and have families before they otherwise would. There is no doubt that the costs of these distorted choices are real and often cruelly high. Popular support for making 19 the year of primary draft eligibility stems largely from the desire to reduce uncertainty and improve opportunity for personal planning. "Channeling" young men into col-

leges, occupations, marriage or fatherhood is not in their best interests nor those of society as a whole.

The procedures of the selective service system also impose hidden costs. In many ways the young registrant is denied due process of law. He is confronted with an intricate legal maze and denied the right of counsel and judicial review during its normal operation. To get his case before the courts, the potential draftee must risk jail sentences of up to five years. The operation of the draft abridges constitutional rights in many other ways. For example, a registrant must get permission to travel outside the country. In addition to the loss of rights, there is the problem of determining who is entitled to exemption as a conscientious objector. These decisions are inherently difficult to make, and are harmful both to the group deciding and the persons requesting conscientious objector status. The process weakens the political fabric of our society and threatens the delicate web of shared values that alone enables a free society to exist. These problems are completely avoided by an all-volunteer force.

Each problem faced by the individual registrant has a counterpart in the institutions with which he must deal. In addition to draft-induced volunteers for the military, selective service results in draft-induced college students, draft-induced ministerial students, draft-induced husbands and fathers, and draft-induced employees in exempt occupations.

The draft creates unnecessary problems for the military. Selection by lottery compels some to serve who have neither a talent nor a taste for military life, resulting in misfits and maladjustments to military service. Draftees who cannot adjust must nevertheless serve out a two-year tour. These men present morale and disciplinary problems which otherwise would not arise. Some spend much of their military service in confinement, because it is so difficult for them to adjust to military service. Dissent within the military presents particularly ticklish problems for the armed forces of a free nation. The problems raised by the forced military service of those who are unwilling or unable to adjust to military life will be largely overcome by voluntary recruiting.

Because of the influence of the draft, our schools and colleges must choose among more applicants than would normally apply. Inevitably they admit some young men more interested in exemptions than education. The presence of these individuals adds to the forces of disruption on the campus, imposing costs on all members of a university community.

Employers, too, must sort out true volunteers from draft-induced applicants for jobs which provide exemptions. For example, when school teachers are deferred, some young men will become teachers for a short time, even though they would rather follow another profession. They will stay in teaching only as long as they require an occupational deferment. This results in higher turnover and less experienced and less dedicated teachers for the young of the country.

It is difficult to add up these costs and measure their overall impact on society. Yet it is easy to cite examples of serious problems created by the draft, which voluntary recruiting would eliminate.

STATE HIGHWAY USER TAXES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in 1934, Congress firmly established as Federal

policy that State highway user taxes should not be diverted by State governments for nonhighway use.

The Hayden-Cartwright Act of June 18, 1934 (23 U.S.C. 126a) declared:

Since it is unfair and unjust to tax motor vehicle transportation unless the proceeds of such taxation are applied to the construction, improvement, or maintenance of highways, after June 30, 1935, Federal aid for highway construction shall be extended only to those states that use at least the amounts provided by law on June 18, 1934, for such purposes in each state from state motor vehicle registration fees, licenses, gasoline taxes, and other special taxes on motor vehicle owners and operators of all kinds for the construction, improvement, and maintenance of highways and administrative expenses in connection therewith, including the retirement of bonds for the payment of which such revenues have been pledged, and for no other purposes, under such regulations as the Secretary of Commerce shall promulgate from time to time.

The constitutionality of this provision has been upheld.

No sooner was this act passed than it became outdated. With the passage of time the penalty provision has been increasingly less effective in its actual application, primarily because it does not apply to new or increased taxes enacted since the penalty was adopted.

Some States have effective constitutional provisions which prevent diversion of highway user revenues to nonhighway purposes. Other States through legislation or executive order have attempted to safeguard the highway trust fund.

For example, Gov. Richard B. Ogilvie of Illinois by executive order has prohibited further diversions of highway user taxes to nonhighway purposes. But almost one-half of the States have no such prohibition and significant diversions of revenues to nonhighway uses have occurred. A report dated October 17, 1969, from the Federal Highway Administration reveals that State highway user revenues amounting to \$789 million were used for nonhighway purposes in 1968, the latest date upon which final figures are available. The chart shows the breakdown by States.

Diversion of highway user revenues was the product of the fiscal emergencies created by the great depression and was continued after that emergency had ended mainly because diversion proved to be an easy rather than a sound way for States to obtain funds. After the depression, diversion was not only continued but accelerated in many States because of pressing financial needs. In many cases, continuation of the diversion habit is carried on simply because it is the line of least resistance.

The practice of siphoning off for nonhighway purposes some portions of the taxes paid by highway users flaunts the intent of Congress in enacting the Hayden-Cartwright Act and runs counter to any equitable system of taxation. The diversion of highway user taxes for nonhighway purposes is also a substantial threat to an adequate and soundly financed highway system.

Because diversion of highway user

taxes occurs on a significant scale, Congress should revise and update the provisions of the Hayden-Cartwright Act to reestablish a firm Federal policy against diversion and deny Federal highway aid to States which divert any portions of their State highway user taxes to nonhighway purposes.

When a State diverts highway tax revenue to nonhighway projects, it places an unfair burden on the motoring public. It means that highway users are required to contribute more than their fair share to the general costs of government.

The effect of diversion is easy to demonstrate. The use of highway money on nonroad projects means the loss to the Nation of many miles of badly needed highways. When the road mileage lost annually through diversion is considered on a nationwide basis, the total is staggering.

Diversion also deprives the motorist of a fair return on his tax dollar. Instead of more roads he gets fewer roads; rather than better roads, he gets poorer roads. At the same time, the motorist often finds his highway taxes still going higher, not to build more and better roads, but to defray the cost of other projects.

The use of highway funds on projects that have nothing whatsoever to do with roads greatly complicates the work of the State highway departments because it is impossible for them to determine accurately how much money will be available for road work over long periods of time.

Because the diversion practice has been continued and has increased, and because national needs for modern highway transportation systems have grown substantially, it is time to take effective action against the practice of diverting State highway user taxes for nonhighway purposes.

Therefore, I propose that the Hayden-Cartwright Act of 1934 be amended to attach a condition to the grant of Federal aid for highways to the States. The amendment I am introducing today states that Federal aid will be extended only to those States that use all revenues derived from State highway user taxes for the construction and maintenance of highways, the administration of highway construction and maintenance programs, highway safety programs and emergency care of highway accident victims, the retirement of highway construction bonds and the retirement of nonhighway bonds secured by highway user revenues before enactment of this act and for no other purposes under rules that the Secretary of Transportation shall promulgate from time to time.

In the next few days, I shall also propose that the Federal Government should also set its own house in order by similarly prohibiting the diversion of funds for nonhighway purposes from the highway trust fund, and by requiring that the automobile excise tax be placed in the trust fund and not in the general treasury. If Congress will take these two affirmative steps, the security of our national highway transportation system will be assured.

HOW STATE HIGHWAY-USER TAXES WERE ALLOCATED IN 1968

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	For State highway purposes															Total
	For collection and administration of taxes		Administration, construction, and maintenance		Highway debt service		State highway police		Total		For local roads and streets		For nonhighway purposes			
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent		
Alabama	\$5,856	3.9	\$27,358	18.6	\$25,034	17.0	\$3,732	2.6	\$56,124	38.2	\$83,290	56.7	\$1,721	1.2	\$46,991	
Alaska	927	8.0	3,150	27.3	3,912	34.0	1,323	11.5	8,385	72.8			2,207	19.2	11,519	
Arizona	4,942	6.2	45,513	57.7			7,693	9.8	53,211	67.5	20,720	26.3			78,973	
Arkansas	1,995	1.9	59,773	59.5	7,175	7.1	4,801	4.9	71,749	71.5	25,730	25.6	956	1.0	100,430	
California	62,867	5.9	436,745	41.1			94,081	8.9	530,826	50.0	300,765	28.3	167,043	15.8	1,061,501	
Colorado	6,544	8.2	38,773	48.8	2,102	2.6	6,606	8.4	47,481	59.8	24,850	31.3	549	.7	79,424	
Connecticut	8,368	7.3	21,735	19.0	56,286	49.2	10,726	9.4	88,747	77.6	16,551	14.4	692	.7	114,358	
Delaware	1,634	5.9	6,268	22.9	15,099	55.3	2,314	8.5	23,681	86.7	2,000	7.4			27,315	
District of Columbia	1,919	7.7									17,738	71.3	5,195	21.0	24,825	
Florida	11,849	3.6	155,984	48.4	18,204	5.7	9,566	2.9	183,754	57.0	18,675	5.8	108,159	33.6	322,437	
Georgia	5,679	3.3	41,014	24.1	10,457	6.1	7,244	4.3	58,715	34.5	67,180	39.6	38,418	22.6	169,992	
Hawaii			5,540	25.2	4,765	21.6			10,305	46.8	9,356	42.6	2,315	10.6	21,976	
Idaho	1,574	4.1	23,131	60.7			2,495	6.6	25,626	67.3	10,854	28.6			38,054	
Illinois	28,289	6.8	154,106	37.3			27,688	6.7	181,794	44.0	170,020	41.2	32,989	8.0	413,092	
Indiana	8,927	4.5	95,644	48.3			8,983	4.5	104,627	52.8	83,728	42.3	708	.4	197,990	
Iowa	4,673	2.8	80,371	49.4			5,004	3.2	85,375	52.6	72,470	44.6			162,518	
Kansas	5,796	6.4	62,310	69.0			5,312	5.9	67,622	74.9	15,888	17.6	971	1.1	90,277	
Kentucky	3,819	2.6	96,385	66.1	28,719	19.7	862	.6	125,966	86.4	15,987	11.0			145,772	
Louisiana	5,763	4.6	80,882	64.5	12,064	9.7	2,136	1.7	95,082	75.9	24,413	19.5			125,258	
Maine	1,754	3.9	32,671	72.7	4,512	10.0	2,834	6.4	40,017	89.1	3,138	7.0			44,909	
Maryland	8,076	4.7	59,357	35.1	28,260	16.7	17,847	10.6	105,464	62.4	55,359	32.7	192	.2	169,091	
Massachusetts	11,657	7.0	85,763	51.5	45,491	27.3	8,031	4.8	139,285	83.6	15,540	9.4			166,482	
Michigan	15,530	4.5	115,211	33.0	43,263	12.4	8,396	2.4	166,870	47.8	166,584	47.7			348,984	
Minnesota	7,935	4.5	90,730	52.0	5,419	3.1	6,886	3.9	103,035	59.0	62,427	35.8	1,076	.7	174,473	
Mississippi	3,657	4.0	39,061	42.9	9,364	10.3	5,799	6.4	54,224	59.6	33,124	36.4			91,005	
Missouri	7,035	4.0	135,375	77.7			11,296	6.5	146,671	84.2	20,394	11.8			174,100	
Montana	1,995	5.2	28,068	73.9			2,364	6.3	30,432	80.2	5,522	14.6			37,949	
Nebraska	2,576	3.5	36,622	50.0			2,596	3.6	39,218	53.6	31,313	42.9			73,107	
Nevada	2,812	10.1	18,021	65.0			1,220	4.4	19,241	69.4	5,667	20.4			27,720	
New Hampshire	1,099	3.2	25,180	73.5	4,477	13.1	2,071	6.1	31,728	92.7	1,311	3.8	82	.3	34,220	
New Jersey	12,454	4.3	74,989	26.2	413	.2	21,976	7.7	97,378	34.1	24,971	8.8	150,737	52.8	285,540	
New Mexico	3,526	7.0	30,203	60.0	1,667	3.3	4,035	8.2	35,955	71.5	6,790	13.5	4,014	8.0	50,285	
New York	25,330	4.6	261,445	47.4	42,899	7.8	39,716	7.2	344,060	62.4	181,151	33.0			550,541	
North Carolina	9,769	4.4	157,224	71.6	22,736	10.4	19,247	8.8	199,207	90.8	10,416	4.8			219,392	
North Dakota	1,003	3.6	15,473	56.4			1,665	6.1	17,138	62.5	8,417	30.7	874	3.2	27,432	
Ohio	18,869	4.2	174,820	38.9	59,083	13.2	18,135	4.0	252,038	56.1	177,832	39.7			448,739	
Oklahoma	5,108	3.5	56,534	39.6	3,029	2.1	6,538	4.7	66,101	46.4	46,645	32.7	24,799	17.4	142,653	
Oregon	6,944	6.4	47,403	43.8	10,022	9.3	7,083	6.6	64,508	59.7	33,584	31.1	3,014	2.8	108,050	
Pennsylvania	13,147	3.1	292,671	69.6	20,194	4.8	29,078	7.0	341,943	81.4	64,865	15.5			419,955	
Rhode Island	1,352	3.6	13,339	36.5	6,327	17.3	1,787	4.9	21,453	58.7	586	1.6	13,189	36.1	36,580	
South Carolina	3,829	3.9	68,816	71.6	719	.7	7,202	7.6	76,737	79.9	10,331	10.7	5,192	5.5	96,089	
South Dakota	1,142	3.2	23,560	67.6			1,852	5.4	25,412	73.0	8,278	23.8			34,832	
Tennessee	5,246	2.7	68,708	35.3	6,711	3.5	5,712	2.9	81,131	41.7	69,376	35.7	38,463	19.9	194,216	
Texas	21,375	4.0	317,012	59.9	109	.0	21,842	4.2	338,963	64.1	38,732	7.3	129,768	24.6	528,838	
Utah	1,771	4.6	28,275	73.4			3,825	9.9	32,100	83.3	4,624	12.1			38,495	
Vermont	615	2.0	13,988	47.3	4,849	16.4	2,889	9.9	21,726	73.6	7,201	24.4			29,542	
Virginia	9,102	4.1	189,623	86.2			2,785	1.4	192,408	87.6	18,220	8.3			219,730	
Washington	10,482	4.7	82,018	37.2	16,632	7.5	13,584	6.2	112,234	50.9	49,289	22.4	48,368	22.0	220,373	
West Virginia	2,468	3.0	71,622	89.3	5,268	6.5	823	1.2	77,713	97.0					80,181	
Wisconsin	9,044	4.8	97,253	52.2	83	.1	8,620	4.7	105,956	57.0	63,186	34.0	7,793	4.2	185,979	
Wyoming	1,421	6.0	15,776	67.3			1,281	5.5	17,057	72.8	4,951	21.2			23,429	
Total	399,544	4.6	4,201,493	48.7	525,344	6.1	489,636	5.7	5,216,473	60.5	2,210,039	25.7	789,484	9.2	8,615,540	

Source: U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, table DF, November 1969.

Text of bill follows:

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 12 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 995, 23 U.S.C. 126) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Since it is unfair and unjust to tax motor-vehicle transportation unless the proceeds of such taxation are applied to the construction, improvement, or maintenance of highways, after June 30, 1935, Federal aid for highway construction shall be extended only to those States that use all revenues derived from State motor vehicle registration and license fees, motor fuel taxes for fuels used in over-the-highway vehicles of all kinds, taxes on lubricating oil, and all other special taxes imposed on owners and operators of motor vehicles used on highways of all kinds, for the construction, improvement, and maintenance of highways and administrative expenses in connection therewith, highway safety patrol, highway safety programs and emergency care of victims of highway accidents, including the retirement of highway construction and improvement bonds, and also the retirement of nonhighway purpose bonds secured by a legally valid pledge of highway user revenues made prior to the enactment of the Act, and for no other purposes, under rules and regulations as the Secretary of Transportation may issue from time to time.

"(b) In no case shall the provisions of this section operate to deprive any State of more than one-third of the entire apportionment authorized under this chapter to which that State would be entitled in any fiscal year, however the reduction in apportionment shall continue from year to year until the State shall discontinue such diversion. The amount of any reduction in a State's apportionment shall be reapportioned in the same manner as any other unexpended balance at the end of the period during which it otherwise would be available in accordance with section 104(b) of this title."

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MINISH) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, there is one sentence expressed in the Manifesto of Independence of Estonia adopted on February 24, 1918, that sums up the hopes of her countrymen about self-determination:

Estonia! Thou standest on the threshold of a hopeful future in which thou wilt be free and independent in determining and directing thy fate.

Estonia thus proclaimed her independence as a democratic Republic after two centuries of czarist Russian rule. England, France, and Italy in May 1918 recognized de facto the Estonian National Council as the supreme power in Estonia. Despite the occupation of the country for several months by the Germans, and the devastation by the requisitions and pillaging of the Russian armies, the Estonian Provisional Government organized Government institutions and established order and Estonian diplomatic relations with the more important Western European countries were regulated.

The defensive war of independence began on November 28, 1918. The 7th Army of Soviet Russia began the attack to conquer Estonia. The turning point in the war came between January 2 and

January 7, 1919. The 6th Division of the Red army was repulsed, the 2d Novgorod Division was held up, and Estonia was able to launch a counteroffensive attack. The Soviet Russian Red army then began to launch a large-scale attack against Estonia. These failed, too, and the Red army was compelled once again to relinquish the initiative in battle to the Estonian forces. In May of 1919, the Estonians were able to repulse the enemy from Estonian territory. On May 18, the first Government of the Republic was formed. On May 19, the constituent assembly proceeded to work out a constitution for the country and establish a land reform program. The provisional constitution was passed on June 4, 1919.

Estonia could again take up commercial relations with foreign countries, while an Estonian delegation at the Paris Peace Conference carried on an intensive campaign for de jure recognition. A final peace treaty with Soviet Russia was signed on February 2, 1920, which stipulated that all former Russian government property on Estonian territory be handed over to the Estonian Government. The war of independence had succeeded.

Estonia, the northernmost of the Baltic countries, with a territory of 18,370 square miles was victorious. It was a brilliant victory. Moreover, it helped to put the Latvian Republic on her feet, it checked German expansion in the northeast, and stopped the advance of Bolshevik Soviet Russian forces westward, which was at that time a significant threat to Western European peace. The unwavering will of the entire Estonian population succeeded in securing and defending its independence.

Unfortunately, the Estonian people enjoyed their hard won freedom only two decades. The Soviet Union overran Estonia during World War II and still continues to occupy the country. The United States, however, has never recognized the forcible incorporation of Estonia by the Soviet Union, and continues to recognize Estonian diplomatic and consular representatives in this country.

When the 89th Congress adopted House Concurrent Resolution 416, it was obvious that the people of America vigorously deplored the denial of self-determination for this Baltic nation. It is our hope that ultimately this valiant country will regain her freedom and independence.

GREAT GALAXY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, recently the C-5 Galaxy cargo aircraft came to San Antonio.

This aircraft has been the subject of great controversy, but after inspecting and riding in it I feel assured that the investment our country has made in the C-5 Galaxy is well worth it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you and my colleagues the account of the giant C-5's visit to San Antonio as reported by Mr. Ed Castillo in the February 1, 1970, San Antonio Light newspaper:

Giant C-5 Has San Antonio Saying "Great Galaxy!"

(By Ed Castillo)

It was love at first sight for airmen, air base employees and 65,000 other San Antonians as they watched the fantastic C-5 Galaxy cargo aircraft touch down at Kelly AFB Saturday.

It was the first visit by the air monster to San Antonio, and air-minded San Antonians turned out in droves to see what the latest super size flying machines looked like, and to bid it welcome.

The largest crowd, led by Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez, Maj. Gen. W. H. Reddell, commander, San Antonio Air Materiel Area; William Ochse, president, San Antonio Chamber of Commerce, and Corky Sledge, head of the chamber's armed forces committee, cheered approval as the super colossal aircraft whooshed by for its first pass over the main Kelly runway.

On its second fly by, aircraft commander Col. Jesse P. Jacobs wanted to show off his proud bird's underpinnings, so he opened up the huge belly and let down what seemed like enough wheels and tires to open up a not-so-small aircraft parts store.

On a third pass, one of Kelly's information officers remarked, "on this one he'll really pour on the coal," which Jacobs proceeded to do. He finally brought Galaxy whining down the runway in what had to be about as smooth a landing as any Air Force veteran could wish for.

As the big bird turned and taxied toward its parking spot, the C141 Starlifter wheeled by, heading for the runway and its long flight to Vietnam. The veteran cargo plane looked small as it passed its big new Air Force brother. After Jacobs switched off his four TF 39 GE engines, each weighs 7,150 lbs., a T29 twin engine aircraft (Convair 240) was parked next to it, and the big bird made it look like a Piper Cub.

Once the fore and aft sections of the plane had been opened, visitors poured through what seemed like the inside of a supersized quonset hut, or maybe one of Kelly's smaller hangars of years gone by. A police security vehicle which had been driven into the aircraft was driven back out by an awed Kelly cop.

In the meantime, Jacobs, a veteran of 27 years in the Air Force who originally hailed from Shelbyville, Tenn., led the group of dignitaries to the "second floor" of the spacious airplane. It was like a proud host taking some of his guests through a new home. "Let me show you the upstairs," said Jacobs, as the officials followed.

TOP DECK

At the back of the cargo compartment (which would make a lovely roller rink), Jacobs climbed a ladder to the top deck where he pointed out a spacious lounge containing some 70 comfortable seats. It could well have been a small theater.

Back down to the main deck then to the front of the imposing aircraft went Jacobs. He led the group up another ladder—this one to his "workshop" where the colonel conducts business. The cockpit of the plane could well be up on about the second floor of a building. The numerous instruments include a closed circuit TV to check instruments in other areas of the plane.

Back of the cockpit are crew quarters which Jacobs compares in comfort to those of a Polaris sub. "All we lack," says the colonel, "is a shower, and I guess we can go a day or two without that."

How does Jacobs, who has flown over 90 different type of aircraft, feel about the handling of the Galaxy?

"The controls are very crisp and very responsive. The Galaxy is more pleasant to fly than a lot of other heavy aircraft, and even some of the smaller ones," says the veteran aviator.

HE LIKES IT

Jacobs, who seems to be as good a public relations man as he is a pilot, is genuinely enthusiastic as he goes through the routine of explaining the plane to newsmen several times.

He compares the Galaxy to football fields, high buildings, and the interior of large garages, but getting right down to basics concerning the new giant of the skies, Jacobs remarks, "It is one of the most important aerospace vehicles the U.S. Air Force has ever purchased."

As Jacobs headed for the officer's club with hopes of getting in a round of golf or two before departing at 3 p.m. Sunday, Kelly employees and their families continued to pour through and around the world's largest aircraft.

Across Kelly's vast network of runways, some visitors spotted the old six-engined KCX99, which only 15 years ago was the talk of the base. The prop driven cargo plane serves as a museum, and also of a reminder of how far the air age has come in a comparatively short period of time.

SAAMA personnel have been ready for changes before, and now they are ready for the Galaxy. For it is they who will furnish logistic support for the important new member of the Air Force family, since it is SAAMA and Kelly which have been designated system support manager for the aircraft and item manager for its TF39 engine.

CARDINAL KROL RECEIVES MAN OF THE YEAR AWARD FROM TEMPLE ADATH ISRAEL

(Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I have often referred to the great city of Philadelphia, for I am truly proud of it and its people. Philadelphia is called the city of brotherly love and it merits that name for it is a city containing many religious, racial, and ethnic groups who work together.

An excellent example of the brotherly love which prevails in Philadelphia occurred several days ago. John Cardinal Krol, archbishop of the Philadelphia Archdiocese, received the Man of the Year Award for brotherhood from Temple Adath Israel. In presenting the award, Rabbi Martin Berkowitz, spiritual leader of the temple, said "because we recognize him as a human being who is genuinely interested in other human beings, whether he knows them or not."

Cardinal Krol said in accepting the award:

As a citizen of Philadelphia, the City of Brotherly Love, I share with all my fellow citizens the commitment to make this a City of Brotherly Love in fact as well as in name.

The above speaks for itself. This demonstrates genuinely—brotherly love.

POMPIDOU AND THE MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the President of the Republic of France yesterday addressed a joint session of the Congress. Today, our newspapers carry comments, editorials, commentary, news

articles, and so forth, regarding the address. Conspicuously absent from the address was a clarification of his government's policy toward the Middle East.

The oldest daily newspaper in the United States, and one of the finest, the Philadelphia Inquirer, this morning contains an excellent editorial commenting on the address, which I believe should not only be read by every Member of the Congress, the President, and the Secretary of State, but also by Mr. Pompidou.

I include the editorial at this point in the RECORD.

POMPIDOU AND THE MIDEAST

In his address to Congress Wednesday, as in earlier public statements since his arrival in Washington Monday, President Pompidou of France has continued to be less than candid concerning his government's policy in the Middle East.

We are, quite frankly, disappointed.

It remains our hope that in the remaining days of his visit to the United States President Pompidou will be more precise and more enlightening in his discussion of Mideast problems than he has been thus far.

He has an excellent opportunity, during his American tour, to disassociate himself and his country from the objectives of Arab fanatics who seek to destroy Israel and to commit atrocities against the Israeli people that would be reminiscent of Hitler at his worst.

President Pompidou cannot do this with bland generalities about peace.

The fact is that France has embarked upon a highly dangerous and extremely explosive course of funneling massive military aid, including jet aircraft, to the Arabs through Libya.

And speaking of fanaticism, it would be hard to find any group more fanatic and irresponsible than the military junta in Libya.

Pompidou's contention that it is better for the Arabs to get their military hardware from France than from the Soviet Union is a flimsy argument indeed. The transparent superficiality of such a lame excuse will fool no one.

The Arabs are getting arms from both Russia and France. There is no indication that increased shipments by France will produce a reduction by the Soviets.

As for President Pompidou's persistence in advocating a four-power solution to the Middle East troubles, how can this be possible when two of the four powers—France and Russia—are openly and actively fueling the Arab war machine?

The way to peace in the Middle East is not to be found in competition with the Soviets for the favor of Arab fanatics, who are dedicated to eradication of the Israeli nation and annihilation of the Israeli people.

FURTHER REVELATIONS ON OUR BETRAYAL OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

(Mr. WAGGONER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, the infamous role this Nation played in sabotaging the government of President Chiang Kai-shek in the 1940's is still coming to light. The most recent and most damning evidence is contained in a publication of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee detailing the espionage activity known as the Amerasia case.

Senator STROM THURMOND's newsletter of February 16 deals with this subject and, rather than try to paraphrase his excellent commentary, I would like to insert it here in the RECORD to make it a permanent part of the history of that period. I have addressed the House on a number of occasions over the years touching upon the infamy of this period in our history and it is encouraging to have this official admission that this espionage and this attack upon our loyal ally, the Chiang government, actually took place as I detailed. This is not a period in which the United States can take much pride, but in all fairness to the Republic of China, our record should be made public for the benefit of historians.

The newsletter follows:

STOLEN DOCUMENTS

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has just published a set of historic documents that tell how American policy in Asia was subverted. The documents in question—the famous Amerasia papers—were stolen from top-secret government files. They included diplomatic and intelligence reports and correspondence. They were recovered in 1945 by the FBI from illegal possession in the office of a Communist collaborator.

Yet the story they tell shows that subversion of policy can sometimes more effectively aid the enemy cause than actual espionage. After twenty-five years, the top-secret classification has been removed. One can read the actual text of the secret reports from China, for example, of U.S. career diplomat John Stewart Service, as he glorified Mao Tse-Tung and the whole Communist apparatus seeking to overthrow Free China. Service and his associates—such as Owen Lattimore, John Carter Vincent, John Paton Davies, Jr., John K. Emmerson—continually told their superiors that the Communists were men of integrity and vision, democratic and peace-loving. Chiang Kai-shek and the leaders of Free China were painted as corrupt, inefficient, reactionary, and lacking the support of the people.

Apologists for Service and his group have claimed that they were merely making accurate assessments of the scene; they even argue that the collapse of Free China proved the collaborators were right.

This defense of subversion collapses now that the texts of the documents are published. The official U.S. policy was to support Chiang Kai-shek; yet here we read the very reports by which Service and his associates did everything possible to undermine confidence in the anti-Communists. Service actually dictated policy from his post in China, and demanded that support be withdrawn from Chiang. He worked to get himself established as a U.S. representative to the Mao headquarters, thereby giving recognition to the Communists. At one critical point, he actually disregarded the orders of the U.S. Ambassador and boldly held a special conference with Mao at a crucial moment.

The cumulative effect of this skillful advocacy of the Chinese Communist cause within the ranks of the U.S. State Department was to weaken the resolve of the President and his top advisors. An embargo was placed upon aid to Chiang, and Chiang was forced to accept a truce with the Communists. We abandoned Free China at the decisive moment.

Meanwhile, the pro-Communist magazine Amerasia was spreading the same propaganda on the home front. The editor and publisher of the magazine, Philip Jacob Jaffe, was a wealthy businessman who gave large sums to the Communist Party, lectured and wrote for the Party, and participated in

various Communist action programs. When the FBI raided the magazine's office, agents found hundreds of top-secret documents relating to U.S. China policy, ranging from the reports of Service to personal correspondence between President Roosevelt and Mao Tse-Tung.

For reasons never fully explained, Jaffe was not tried for espionage; he pleaded guilty to conspiracy to steal U.S. documents, and paid a fine of \$2500. Service, who had a close relationship with Jaffe, was arrested, but not indicted. He returned to the Foreign Service, and retired in due course.

Twenty-five years after the fact, these documents appear at a propitious time. The Nixon Administration is reassessing U.S. policy towards Communist China. Talks are being held with the Red Chinese ambassador in Warsaw. Such talks can be very deceptive. We now have the benefit of hard experience. We know what Chiang Kai-Shek has done for his people on Taiwan; we know also what Mao has done on the mainland. We should not forget that a small band of dedicated careerists started us off on a path that has led to the enslavement of 700 million people, and to the fighting of two major wars, in Korea and Vietnam.

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND.

COMPLAINTS NOTICEABLY ABSENT AS CONCORDE BOOMS OVER LAND

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it has been widely reported by opponents of the supersonic transport program that we should not proceed with an SST because of the sonic boom.

I have continually brought to the attention of my colleagues that we are in the era of the SST, whether opponents like it or not, with both the British-French Concorde and the Russian TU-144 undergoing test flights at this time.

But, aside from the economic arguments that favor the U.S. continuation of the SST program, the matter of the sonic boom has been more clearly defined and indicates strongly that the effect is nowhere near the disastrous proportions excitedly proclaimed by the opposition.

It is said the Presidential committee that studied the SST, stated:

All available information indicates that the effects of sonic boom are such as to be considered intolerable by a very high percentage of the people affected.

The phrase "all available information" is important, Mr. Speaker, for I have said all along that one of the reasons for prototype development, such as we are now engaged, is to study these problems. But, again, ahead of us the British and French have been flying their SST at supersonic speeds over both water and land. The sonic boom effect has been of little significance.

For the information of my colleagues, I include an article on this subject, reported in the February 19, 1970, issue of the *Machinist*, at this point in the RECORD:

COMPLAINTS NOTICEABLY ABSENT AS CONCORDE BOOMS OVER LAND

The first results of supersonic flight tests of the British-French Concorde SST are exciting SST supporters the world over.

Concorde 001, the first prototype, has now logged more than 21 hours of flight time at speeds up to 1,070 miles an hour. The operating results, called "Perfect" by Sud Aviation's test pilot Jean Franchi, were overshadowed only by the effect or lack of it, of the sonic boom.

The French were daring enough to put their SST through its paces over land as well as over the ocean. Sud officials report there have been no damage claims filed because of the boom, and no significant increase in noise complaints since the supersonic tests began in five air corridors over Southern France.

Franchi reports that the first supersonic flight was flown "very cautiously," but the plane performed so well that he was soon arcing 180-degree turns with 50-degree bank angles, all at supersonic speeds. Franchi adds that the only real way he could tell when the Concorde broke the sound barrier was to watch the instruments.

MOOD CONTROL PUTTING THE DRUG PROBLEM INTO CONTEXT

(Mr. HANNA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, in his new book "The Perfect Day," Ira Levin describes a future in which every person's mood is programed. Once every week all humanity lines up to receive a shot of mood control drugs. A computer is charged with the responsibility of administering the appropriate chemicals to each man. For 7-day cycles men and women live their programed routine, acting and reacting in the manner in which the drug given them dictates. Human emotion, intelligence, and freedom are replaced by a computer determined drug.

Of course, Mr. Levin's book is fiction. What is not fiction, however, is rising legal and illegal use of mood control substances. I purposefully chose to begin my remarks with a brief description of Mr. Levin's theme in order to more dramatically underline my concern over the lack of congressional understanding and sensitivity to the issue of mood control.

Before proceeding any further, let me define my terms. When I talk of mood control, I am referring to the process of artificially producing a state of mind, feeling, or emotion. The artificial process is usually in the form of some drug administered orally, inhaled, or by injection into the bloodstream.

I realize that when I use the term "mood control" I am discussing a concept not yet popularized nor adequately understood. In the context of today's thinking, we tend to discuss the issue of mood control in terms of illegal drug abuse.

Those whose frame of reference is "drug abuse" are intellectually conditioned to believe this is actually the problem. In fact, it is not the problem. Drug abuse and illegal use of drugs is one of the manifestations of the real problem. And the real problem is the desire, for whatever one's reason, to artificially induce a mood—whether that mood be euphoric, calm, aggressive, tranquil, or another of an increasing number of mood choices. Let me stress again that drugs are abused in order to effect a change in mood.

While it is important whether people use drugs legally or illegally, the most important questions to be answered are why are we using these drugs in the first place, and what are the implications for the future as mood drugs become more advanced, more accessible, and more tolerated. Unfortunately, no one today can adequately answer these two questions. And unless our emphasis changes, we may never be able to answer the questions.

When Congress understands that the substance of the matter before it is not the isolated question of illegal drug abuse, but in fact the entire matter of mood control, it will have come a long way toward putting this issue in the perspective required to effectively deal with it.

When we put the drug issue in the context of mood control, and then look at the problem, we realize how complicated and contradictory both our law and morals are on this question. We also realize how little we know.

Let me say before proceeding further with this statement that it is not my intention to issue a blanket indictment of mood drugs. When the administration of these drugs is carefully administered and monitored by a physician their medical usefulness cannot be questioned. Many of these drugs are being appropriately applied to emotional and physical disorders we were unable to competently deal with only a few short years ago.

My concern is directed primarily at the increasing legal and illegal use and abuse of these drugs without a physician's knowledge or supervision. I am concerned over the extent to which people are willing to, without professional direction, induce serious mood changes by using chemical substances they have obtained from either the drugstore, liquor store, or underground market.

Mood control substances are legally available and their use is increasing with society's approval. Mood control substances are illegally available and their use is increasing, but condemned by society. These two statements are contradictory, but both are true. As a matter of fact, in many instances the same drugs are involved.

Amphetamines are a good example. Americans seem to have few, if any, objections to the use of amphetamines as mood control agents. As a matter of fact, we legally produced 8 billion of these pep pills last year—enough for 40 legal doses for every man, woman, and child in the country. Yet we scream with indignation when young people obtain and use them illegally.

What this suggests, and this of course is only one example, is that we will not only tolerate, but indulge in mood control as long as it is sanctioned by law, and despite medical warnings on over using mood pills. We seem to be willing to accept mood control substances as part of our culture, as long as they are not obtained illegally, or used by our young.

Evidence of this can be gained in any drugstore. One does not even need a doctor's prescription to purchase such ex-

otic sounding mood drugs as Alva Tranquil, Compoz, Vivarin, Devarex, Nervine, Somicaps, Sta Kalm, and a wide variety of other products. There are over 100 of these on the market. Americans spend tens of millions of dollars each year on these over the counter mood control drugs.

Almost 17 percent of all prescription drugs in 1968 were either tranquilizers or stimulants. Approximately 170 million prescriptions during 1968, the most recent year with available information, were for tranquilizers or stimulants. Add to this the \$15 billion worth of alcohol, one of man's oldest mood inducing drugs, consumed in 1968, and you have a fair idea of the acceptable and legal amount of mood control drugs used in 1 year.

Mood control drugs, like alcohol, have always been with man. But recently, perhaps in the last 15 years, mood drugs of all sorts have become legal and overwhelmingly available. And Americans, by the millions, use these drugs in increasing dosages and varieties every year—many disregarding their physician's recommendations on the quantity or on how often the pills are to be taken.

A society this hooked on legally available and increasing numbers of mood drugs has quite a credibility gap when it attempts to focus the thrust of the drug problem upon the illegal use of many of these same, and other, chemical substances by the young.

We are rightfully charged with hypocrisy. It is absurd to condone rising mood drug use among adults, and condemn the practice among the young.

A good deal of the generation gap in regard to drugs can be explained by these frames of reference. Parents tend to look at drugs in the context of illegal abuse. Their children view drugs in terms of the mood produced when taken. I have found, however, that there is no generation gap in the actual use of drugs. Both parents and their children are taking mood drugs at increasing rates. The principle differences between the generations seems to be how they obtain the drugs, the choice of drugs used, and the reasons for mood drug use.

We hear more about the kids because their primary sources of drugs are from illegal markets. Their parents are capable of obtaining mood drugs by prescription or over the counter—particularly the liquor counter.

While apparently the young prefer marijuana, which is illegal, their parents depend on alcohol and tranquilizers, both legal and available.

Young people most often tell us they use mood substances in order to "break out" or for a "trip." Adult users consume their chemical mood inducers in order, their children are told, so they can cope with everyday life.

The point, of course, is not in the differences between the reasons, kind, or source of mood control substances. The point is that mood control has become acceptable to young and old, when it once was confined primarily to adults. Each accuses the other of being responsible for the drug problem, when in fact, all use mood drugs—and at increasing rates.

My concern is directed equally at the rising incidence of legal and illegal mood

drug use. I am as concerned about rising mood drugs used by adults as I am by their children. I cannot agree with those who suggest we become more permissive in the use of mood drugs. We are already overwhelmed by the legal use of these drugs and no one understands what further intellectual and cultural tolerance means in terms of the future. It is entirely likely that adequate research would probably determine that many are legal, and even more are illegally, polluting their mental process in their abuses of mood drugs. This could turn out to be the most damaging pollution problem of our times. No one really knows if this is the case. Even the most permissive among us could not, I believe, support a world in which our humanity was replaced by drugs—the world described by Mr. Levin.

Nor can I agree with those who believe all our problems will be solved by simply passing laws providing for stricter law enforcement aimed at illegal drug use. While we may reduce illegal use of mood drugs, the legal use of these drugs will continue to rise. Americans will continue, increased numbers, to take advantage of an increasing variety of drugs.

The real danger of putting all our eggs in the law-enforcement basket, is that we can be lulled into believing that we are dealing with the problem, when we will only really be dealing with a symptom. Illegal drug abuse is only a manifestation of our society's willingness to use mood control substances.

The real problem will continue to grow, and may reach a point from which we will be unable to return. We may find that we have made for ourselves a culture in which, as the noted British scientific journalist, Gordon Rattray Taylor, suggested:

No longer will people be happy or sad, amicable or aggressive, active or lazy, calm or anxious, merely because it was their nature or because circumstances evoked the mood; they will be so because they took the appropriate pill.

Earlier I raised two questions. I asked, Why are we taking these drugs? I am sure many will come forward with answers. And while I, and others, have opinions, they are not based on adequate facts. We do not have the facts, and little is being done to obtain the needed facts. Our scientific community has neither been given the resources nor direction.

The second question I asked was, What are the implications of present drug use on the future? No one can adequately answer this question. Hardly anyone is asking it. We have pitifully few hard facts on what mood drugs are doing to us today, let alone what their future implications might be.

And as we learn more about the human brain, new kinds of drugs will become available. Scientists have already reported developing a substance that can control aggression. Others have produced a chemical substance that induces fear. The next few decades will bring mood drugs that make LSD and speed look like aspirin. Our increasing medical technology in mood control demands that we revise our thinking and change our present one-dimensional direction on this issue.

Let me suggest a course of action that I believe will help answer the two questions I raised, and thereby help us meet the serious challenge that the mood drugs present.

First, Congress should declare as urgent our need to understand the ramifications of the present mood drug revolution. These ramifications are both in attitude, as evidenced by the increasing use of mood drugs; and, second, our scientific technology that continually discovers new substances that effect mood.

Next, adequate funds must be made available to the National Institute of Mental Health. These funds should be used to carry on an extensive research effort. The research should be aimed at every aspect of mood drug use—why they are used, and abused, what are their effects on the human mind and body, the implications of long-term use, and what we might anticipate in the future.

I have introduced legislation, cosponsored by 31 other Members, that would double NIMH funds in mood control drug research. At present, we spend about \$12 million in this area. My bill would authorize \$25 million. We need the facts. We presently do not have them. Without them we cannot make rational decisions. The information obtained from this research must be intensively disseminated as envisioned in the Drug Abuse Education Act which I cosponsored last year. Only through abundant and accurate information will the public and the Congress obtain a real appreciation of the issues we must decide upon.

The NIMH should be directed to develop a coherent policy on mood drugs. We should ask it to recommend our Nation's ground rules for the use of all these mood drugs. And we should require NIMH to suggest changes in the laws that will be consistent with these ground rules and sound medical evidence.

Finally, we should vigorously prosecute our fight against illegal drug use. However, this effort should be in perspective to our total concern over the mood control drugs. It should not be our primary preoccupation at the expense of the more fundamental components of our policy.

Today, the law-enforcement aspect of this issue is our primary concern. This is due primarily to the fact that the issue has never been adequately identified by public leaders. Hopefully, this statement will assist in more precisely defining the challenge.

Second, law enforcement, as a means for dealing with complicated problems, is easy to advocate because it is both popular and well understood. Politicians tend to exaggerate the popular solution out of all proportion to its ability to deal with the problem. As a result, the public often confuses both the problem and the solution. This is now our situation, and we are all responsible.

Before Congress is a wide range of bills, including two of my own, which have law enforcement as their principle theme for controlling drug use. There is very little legislation dealing with the more basic questions of policy concerning mood drugs. The danger of such overemphasis on only one part of the mood control drug

issue is that law enforcement has become the principle solution being offered. And it is being offered at the expense of considering the other vital aspects of what should be our policy.

The main enforcement proposal, offered by the President, goes so far that it hands the whole question of policy over to the Attorney General. While I agree that he should be responsible for the enforcement end of the problem, he should not be making medical decisions, or carrying on the research function. Such an emphasis on enforcement and the Attorney General will leave untouched the larger questions which I explored earlier.

While I favor strong enforcement for the illegal drug use component of the mood drug problem, there are a number of very offensive and dangerous recommendations in the President's proposal. It is a prime example of what happens when the issue becomes confused, and the most simple and popular solutions pushed.

Among the offensive provisions are the Attorney General's ability to interfere with physician-patient relations, requiring physicians to keep absurdly detailed records, and transferring the essence of mood drug policymaking from a medical and scientific agency to a law-enforcement agency. Most offensive is the so-called no-knock provision of the bill, which in the hysteria for a law-enforcement solution to mood drug use, we may very well sacrifice some of our most fundamental and basic rights. At the end of this statement, I will append two editorials, one from the Santa Ana Register, and one from the Los Angeles Times. Both papers expose the no-knock feature of the President's bill for the dangerous precedent it establishes. These provisions must not be allowed to pass the House.

The misguided features of the bill amply demonstrate the type of legislation that can result when there is a lack of understanding about the nature of a problem. Mood control drugs are in the realm of those issues that inflame the passions, and as a result discussions about policy more often become abusive shouting matches, and are open to the basest type of demagogic appeal. Politicians have an extra obligation to be responsible on this issue. The climate of opinion we create must, in our form of government, influence our decisions—and decisions on mood control drugs affect the most important and valuable organ we possess—our mind. It would be the highest form of irony if we proved incapable of dealing rationally with an issue that physically affects our source of reason.

It is my hope that this statement offers a beginning to the discussion on the entire question of mood control. I firmly believe that we must deal with the issue in this context. We have devoted much too much time to talking about mood control in terms of the one dimensional, but most visible, manifestation of the issue—illegal drug use by the young. The use of mood control drugs permeates every age and group in the Nation. It is not confined to the college or high school

campus. These drugs are found in the medicine chest, on drugstore counters, and in liquor stores. It is a problem that promises to increase as we learn more about the human brain and how to control its processes.

Once we understand all this we will be much better prepared to deal with the basic questions already raised—questions that cannot be answered today. The Federal Government must be required to take the lead. We will have to rely heavily on the advice of our medical and scientific communities. But we will also have to consult equally with religious leaders, and our Nation's recognized social philosophers. Mood control is more than just a scientific question, or a question that can be answered by a government. This issue goes to the very fabric of man, and it is only by gaining an acceptable definition of who we are will we be able to deal rationally with drugs that are capable of altering us.

The above-mentioned editorials follow:

[From the Santa Ana (Calif.) Register]

NO KNOCK ON THE DOOR

The Senate has passed the so-called "no-knock" authorization in connection with its efforts to catch drug suspects.

As passed by the Senate and sent to the House, the bill provides that if police have cause to believe there are drugs in a home or other building, they can go to a judge and get a search warrant. Then they don't have to knock, they can barge into the building and conduct the search—presumably they can even break down the door.

Sen. John McClellan of Arkansas is one of the defenders of the severe narcotics law, which includes the "no-knock" provision.

"We've got a war on our hands, a war against crime," he said, according to Don Oakley of Newspaper Enterprise Association.

That, of course, is the reason many well-meaning people in government—and some outside of government—give when they approve legislation which violates the rights of the individuals. The war against communism is given as the reason for using involuntary servitude (the draft) to send soldiers around the world, just as politicians used the war against Nazism in World War II.

But once the politicians invade individuals' rights in the name of a "war" or in the guise of some other "good" cause, the individual does not regain those rights.

This is not to defend those who prey on others in the sale of narcotics. But if officers have the authority to break down one's door because someone believes there are narcotics inside, they can use the authority for some other purpose.

There have been mistakes. If an officer makes a mistake and believes that a home is being used by a narcotics peddler, he can get a judge to sign a search warrant which authorizes the officers to break down the door. It would seem to us there should be a rather severe penalty against both officers and judge if the homes of innocent parties are entered in this manner.

There already are too many instances in which government agencies invade the privacy of individuals. The House of Representatives should quickly discard this no-knock authorization.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Feb. 2, 1970]

"NO-KNOCK" AND BASIC RIGHTS

(ISSUE.—What is wrong with the Senate-passed provision allowing unannounced entry into private homes by narcotics agents?)

In their understandable concern to give

law enforcement authorities new weapons to fight the growing crime problem in the nation, the Administration and Congress may unwittingly be moving to erode certain rights which are fundamental to the preservation of a free society.

Preventive detention of certain suspects, who could be held without bail for up to 60 days in the belief that they might if released commit crimes, is one example. The latest move is contained in a bill passed by the Senate last week which could permit federal investigators in narcotics cases to break into homes without warning or identification.

The "no-knock" provision was part of an omnibus drug-control bill which contains many good features. The intent of the no-knock statute is to strengthen the evidence-gathering powers of law enforcement officers. But inescapably, the provision represents a threat to the privacy and security of all citizens.

The statute allows an officer, after obtaining a warrant from a judge, to enter a home or other building without notice (e.g., by kicking down a door) if the judge issuing the warrant can be convinced that illicit narcotics are on the site and "will be" destroyed or disposed of if advance notice of entry were given.

Under present law narcotics agents seeking entry must first identify themselves. This has sometimes resulted in suspects destroying evidence before permitting agents to enter. The sudden, unannounced entry which the new statute would permit is supposed to get around this.

But the statute is confusing.

It is not clear if it is permissive or mandatory, that is, whether a judge must issue a no-knock warrant after being told by agents illegal narcotics are at a certain site. Moreover it demands prescience which no man, judge or otherwise, possesses. How is anyone to know whether evidence "will be" destroyed?

Beyond this, the potential for abuse and error in implementing the new authority is vast.

To take out one example, what if federal agents make a mistake and kick down the door of the wrong house? And what if the inhabitants of that house, properly terrified by this invasion, try to flee, or respond by taking up one of the millions of guns in private hands to shoot at the intruders? What then?

The possibilities of practical error and tragedy resulting from this new statute could be multiplied. The overriding issue in any case is plain. The no-knock provision smacks too much of the authority given the Soviet secret police or the Gestapo. It is destructive of our basic rights, and the House should act with greater wisdom than the Senate and reject it.

AUTONOMY AND THE UNITED MINE WORKERS

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about the lack of autonomy in many of the district offices of the United Mine Workers of America. In my State of West Virginia, none of the district officials are elected by the members, but are handpicked by the top officials of the United Mine Workers of America in Washington, D.C. This lack of autonomy at the district level persists despite the fact that West Virginia is the largest coal-mining State in the Union.

For several years there has been pending a suit in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, because the continued long existence of these "trusteeships" constitutes a clear violation of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act. The suit by the Secretary of Labor has been delayed for over 5 years, and a number of efforts are persistently made by the United Mine Workers of America to further delay the start of the trial. To clarify the issues involved, I have obtained copies of the pretrial statement filed by the Secretary of Labor with the court, as well as the UMWA pretrial statement in defense, which follow:

[In the United States District Court for the District of Columbia]

(George P. Shultz, Secretary of Labor, U.S. Department of Labor, Plaintiff, v. United Mine Workers of America, et al., Defendants—Civil action No. 3071-64.)

PLAINTIFF'S PRETRIAL STATEMENT
NATURE OF THE PROCEEDINGS

The Secretary of Labor has brought this action against the United Mine Workers of America and the officers of Districts 4, 6, 7, 17, 23, 30, and 31 of the Union pursuant to Title III of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 519 et. seq., 29 U.S.C. 461 et seq.) for a declaratory judgment declaring that the continuance of the trusteeships over the said districts constitutes a violation of the Act in that it is not necessary for any of the purposes allowable under 29 U.S.C. 462, and enjoining defendants from continuing such trusteeships.

The defendant International Union is divided into districts, sub-districts, and local unions. The districts are chartered by and subordinate to the International Union, and, under the International Constitution, districts are granted certain rights and responsibilities regarding the conduct of union affairs within their jurisdiction. All local unions are attached to the district organizations encompassing the geographical area within which they are located.

RELEVANT STATUTORY PROVISIONS

Section 402(h) of 29 U.S.C. provides that a "trusteeship" means any receivership, trusteeship, or other method of supervision or control whereby a labor organization suspends the autonomy otherwise available to a subordinate body under its constitution or bylaws.

Section 402(i) of 29 U.S.C. defines a "labor organization" as an organization of any kind "in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours, or other terms or conditions of employment, and any conference, general committee, joint or system board, or joint council so engaged, which is subordinate to a national or international labor organization..."

Section 461 of 29 U.S.C. provides that every labor organization which assumes a trusteeship over any subordinate labor organization shall file with the Secretary of Labor within 30 days after September 14, 1959, or the imposition of such trusteeship, and semi-annually thereafter, a report signed by its President and Treasurer or corresponding principal officers, as well as by the trustees of such subordinate labor organization, containing the following information:

1. The name and address of the subordinate organization.
2. The date of establishing the trusteeship.
3. A detailed statement of the reason or reasons for establishing or continuing the trusteeship.

4. The nature and extent of participation by the membership of the subordinate organization in the selection of delegates to represent such organization in regular or special conventions or other policy-determining bodies and in the election of officers of the labor organization which has assumed trusteeship over such subordinate organization.

During the continuance of the trusteeship, the labor organization which has assumed the trusteeship is also required to file on behalf of the subordinate labor organization the annual financial report required by Section 431(b) showing assets and liabilities, receipts, salaries, disbursements, and loans.

Section 462 of 29 U.S.C. provides that trusteeships shall be established and administered by a labor organization over a subordinate body in accordance with the constitution and by-laws of the organization and for the following purposes:

1. Correcting corruption or financial malpractice.
2. Assuring the performance of collective bargaining agreements or other duties of a bargaining representative.
3. Restoring democratic procedures or otherwise carrying out the legitimate objectives of such labor organizations.

Section 464 of 29 U.S.C. provides that upon complaint of any member of the subordinate body of a labor organization alleging that a violation of the sub-chapter entitled "Trusteeships" (except Section 461), the Secretary shall investigate and if he finds probable cause to believe that a violation has occurred, he may bring an action for such relief, including injunctions, as may be appropriate. In any such action a trusteeship shall be presumed to be valid for a period of eighteen months after its establishment, but after the expiration of eighteen months the trusteeship shall be presumed to be invalid and its discontinuance shall be decreed unless the labor organization shall show clear and convincing proof that the continuance of the trusteeship is necessary for a purpose allowable under Section 462.

RELEVANT FACTS AS TO WHICH THERE IS NO DISPUTE

1. The defendant, United Mine Workers of America (UMWA), an unincorporated association, is a labor organization engaged in an industry affecting commerce within the meaning of Sections 3(i) and 3(j) of the Act (29 U.S.C. 402(i) and (j)), and maintains its principal office in the District of Columbia within the jurisdiction of this Court (Def. Ans., par. III).

2. The UMWA represents workers in the United States and Canada who are employed in the coal industry, i.e., in and around coal mines, coal washeries, coal processing plants, coke ovens, and other related operations (Def. Resp. to Pl. Req. for Admissions No. 2).

3. The founding Convention of the United Mine Workers of America, held on January 25, 1890, assigned certain district numbers to certain geographical areas. The assignments made at that time were from number 1 through 21, as follows:

Districts: 1. Anthracite—Pennsylvania. 2. Central Pennsylvania. 3. Low Grade—Pennsylvania. 4. Coke Regions—Pennsylvania. 5. Pittsburgh District—Pennsylvania. 6 to 10. Ohio. 11. Indiana. 12. Illinois. 13. Iowa. 14. Missouri and Kansas. 15. Colorado, Washington and the Territories. 16. Maryland. 17. West Virginia. 18. Virginia. 19. Tennessee and Kentucky. 20. Alabama and Georgia. 21. Texas, Arkansas, and the Indian Territory.

From time to time thereafter district numbers were reassigned and new district numbers were assigned. The subsequent history of the districts numbered 4, 6, 7, 17, 23, and 31 is set forth below.

District 4. The affairs of the union within the geographical area designated as District

4 have been administered by a provisional organization since at least 1922.

District 6. Subsequent to the assignment of numbers 6 through 10 to Ohio in January, 1890, a district organization to administer the affairs of the Union within the entire State of Ohio, which was given the name "District 6," was established. The Panhandle section of northern West Virginia was included in the area covered by District 6 at some later date. It was autonomous until 1931. District 6 was given semi-autonomous status in 1939.

District 7. The number 7, which had originally been assigned to Ohio, was assigned to territory in Pennsylvania which had previously been included within District 1 in 1898. A district organization was created in this territory at that time. The autonomy for District 7 was terminated on October 8, 1941. On or before April 1, 1969, Districts 1, 7, and 9 were merged to form Provisional District 25.

District 17. Since the assignment of the number 17 to the State of West Virginia in January 1890, three areas within that State have been assigned to other districts. The northern Panhandle of West Virginia is now within District 6, northern West Virginia now constitutes District 31, and southeastern West Virginia now constitutes District 29. A district organization was established within District 17 in April, 1890. The district organization was autonomous for some period of time thereafter. Autonomy was temporarily suspended for the period between February 21, 1916 and January 1, 1917. On June 16, 1924, following an extended strike, a provisional district organization was established which has continued to date.

District 23. The number 23 was assigned to southwestern Kentucky and Tennessee south of Chattanooga, which had previously been included within the area designated as District 19, at some time in 1892. An autonomous district organization (No. 23) was created within this area.

District 30. The number 30 was assigned to eastern Kentucky, which had previously been included within the area designated as parts of Districts 17 and 19, on January 8, 1920. The affairs of the union in eastern Kentucky have been administered by a provisional organization since the number 30 was assigned to that area on January 8, 1920.

District 31. The number 31 was assigned to northern West Virginia, which had previously been included within the area designated as District 17, in March 1926. In March, 1926, the International Executive Board assigned the number 31 to northern West Virginia, which had previously been included in the territory assigned to District 17. A charter was issued to a district organization on May 1, 1926. This district organization has remained provisional since its creation and has never been autonomous. (Def. Partial Ans. to Int. Nos. 1, 3, & 5).

4. Prior to 1930, Article III, Section 2 of the Constitution of the International Union, UMWA, read as follows:

Sec. 2. All Districts, Sub-Districts and Local Unions must be chartered by, and shall be under the jurisdiction of and subject to the laws of the International Union and rulings of the International Executive Board. Charters can be revoked only by the International President, whose action shall be subject to approval by the International Executive Board." (Def. Resp. to Pl. Req. for Adm. No. 3).

5. In 1930, Article III, Section 2 of the Constitution of the International Union, UMWA, was amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. All Districts, Sub-Districts and Local Unions must be chartered by, and shall be under the jurisdiction of and subject to the laws of the International Union and rulings of the International Executive Board. Charters of Districts, Sub-Districts and Local Unions may be revoked by the International President, who shall have authority

to create a provisional government for the subordinate branch whose charter has been revoked. This action of the International President shall be subject to review by the International Executive Board upon appeal by any officers deposed or any members affected thereby. Until such review is had and unless said order of revocation is set aside, all members, officers and branches within the territory affected by the order of revocation shall respect and conform to said order. An appeal may be had from the decision of the Executive Board upon such order of revocation, to the next International Convention." (Def. Resp. to Pl. Req. for Adm. No. 4.)

6. The district officers of the UMWA for Districts 5, 8, 11, and 22 are normally elected by members of the UMWA within those districts. Such officers may be otherwise selected under unusual circumstances, such as the occurrence of a vacancy during a district officer's term. (Def. Resp. to Pl. Req. for Adm. No. 6.)

7. The representatives of Districts 5, 8, 11, and 22 who serve on the International Executive Board are normally elected by the members of the UMWA within those districts. Such representatives may be otherwise selected under unusual circumstances such as the occurrence of a vacancy during the term of office of the district representative. (Def. Resp. to Pl. Req. for Adm. No. 7.)

8. The district officers of the UMWA within District 6, other than the District President and Secretary-Treasurer, are normally elected by the members of the UMWA within District 6, although such officers may be otherwise selected under unusual circumstances such as the occurrence of a vacancy during a district officer's term (Def. Resp. to Pl. Req. for Adm. No. 8.)

9. The representative of District 6 who serves on the International Executive Board is elected by the members of the UMWA within District 6, although such representative may be otherwise selected under unusual circumstances such as the occurrence of a vacancy during the term of office of the district representative. (Def. Resp. to Pl. Req. for Adm. No. 9.)

10. The International President has appointed the District President and Secretary-Treasurer for District 6 since April 8, 1931. (Def. Resp. to Pl. Req. for Adm. No. 10.)

11. The International President has appointed the district officers for the following districts:

District 4—since June 14, 1923. District 7—since October 8, 1941. District 17—since June 26, 1924. District 23—since in the early 30's. District 30—since January 8, 1920. District 31—since May 1, 1926. (Def. Resp. to Pl. Req. for Adm. No. 11.)

12. The International President has also appointed the District officers for the following districts: Nos. 2, 3, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 27, 28, and 29. (Def. Resp. to Pl. Req. for Adm. Nos. 10(a) and 11.)

13. Prior to 1960, the International President appointed a representative from each of at least the following districts to serve on the International Executive Board: Nos. 4, 7, 17, 23, 30, and 31. (Def. Resp. to Pl. Req. for Adm. No. 12.)

14. The appointments made by the International President in the previous paragraph were made subject to the approval of the International Executive Board. (Def. Resp. to Pl. Req. for Adm. No. 13.)

15. In 1960 and in 1964, the International Convention designated the representative from each of the districts named in paragraph 11, *supra*, to serve on the International Executive Board. (Def. Resp. to Pl. Req. for Adm. No. 14.)

16. Since 1960, vacancies which have occurred between International Conventions in the office of a representative to the International Executive Board from any of the districts named in paragraph 11, *supra*, have been filled by appointment made by the In-

ternational President, subject to the approval of the International Executive Board. (Def. Resp. to Pl. Req. for Adm. No. 15.)

17. The *United Mine Workers Journal* is the official publication of the UMWA. (Def. Resp. to Pl. Req. for Adm. No. 60.)

18. The *United Mine Workers Journal* is published by the International Executive Board, UMWA. (Def. Resp. to Pl. Req. for Adm. No. 61.)

ISSUES OF LAW AND FACT

1. UMWA Districts 4, 6, 7, 17, 23, 30, and 31 Are Labor Organizations Within the Meaning of Section 402(h) and (i) of 29 U.S.C.

The districts are separate and distinct labor organizations which are chartered by the International Union. They own property, have bank accounts, pay rent, taxes, and insurance on property, hire employees, adjust disputes between the local unions and the coal operators. Each district is entitled to a representative on the International Executive Board which is the chief policy-making body of the International Union.

2. UMWA Districts 4, 6, 7, 17, 23, 30, and 31 Were Placed in Trusteeship by the UMWA Which Placed Them in Provisional or Semi-Autonomous Status.

By maintaining these districts in provisional or semi-autonomous status, the defendant International Union has denied the districts the right guaranteed by the Constitution of the International and by 29 U.S.C. Sec. 481, *et seq.*, to elect their own officers and to elect members of the International Executive Board.

3. The International Union Has Not Continued the Trusteeships of Districts 3, 4, 6, 7, 17, 23, 30, and 31 for a Purpose Allowable Under Section 462 of 29 U.S.C.

The said trusteeships have been in existence for more than eighteen months. Under 29 U.S.C. Sec. 464(c), trusteeships are presumed to be invalid unless the International Union can prove by clear and convincing evidence that they have been continued in good faith for a purpose allowable under Section 462 of 29 U.S.C. It is plaintiff's contention that no such allowable purpose can be proved.

REQUESTS FOR STIPULATIONS

The defendant, United Mine Workers, will be asked to stipulate the following:

1. If by the date of trial the reporter has not filed the originals with the Court, copies of the following depositions may be used at the trial: John P. Cassidy, James W. Kelley, Joseph Yablonski, Michael Budzanoski, and James G. Marks, Jr.

2. The deposition of John Owens, George Titler, and W. A. Boyle may be used at the trial for any purpose.

3. Authenticity of copies of the forms LM-2 and LM-15, the originals of which were signed by the officers of the Union or of the districts, is admitted without waiving objections as to relevancy.

4. Authenticity of copies of official publications of United Mine Workers is admitted without waiving objections as to relevancy.

Estimate of Trial Time: 3 days.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM D. RUCKELSHAUS,
Assistant Attorney General.

THOMAS A. FLANNERY,
U.S. Attorney.

HARLAND F. LEATHERS,
DAVID ORLIKOFF,
Attorneys, Department of Justice, Attorneys for Plaintiff.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that service of the attached Plaintiff's Pretrial Statement was made on defendants by mailing a true copy thereof to their attorney, Edward L. Carey, Esquire, 900-15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005 on this 12th day of January, 1970.

DAVID ORLIKOFF,
Attorney, Department of Justice, Attorney for Plaintiff.

DEFENDANTS' PRETRIAL STATEMENT

Come now Defendants, United Mine Workers of America, et al., by their duly authorized attorneys, for their Pretrial Statement and state as follows:

FACTS

Defendant United Mine Workers of America (hereinafter referred to as "International Union") is admittedly a labor organization, representing workers in the United States and Canada who are employed in and around coal mines, coal washeries, coal processing plants, coke ovens, and other related industries. All other Defendants are presidents and secretary-treasurers, respectively, of Districts 4, 6, 7, 17, 23, 30 and 31.

The International Union is the sole collective bargaining representative of the workers it represents, and does so in the name of the International Union, United Mine Workers of America, on behalf of each member thereof.

Continuously since 1945, the International Union has negotiated national wage agreements. In order to uniformly administer these national agreements throughout the twenty-eight coal producing States and Canada, the International Union's Constitution authorizes (but does not require) its elected officers to establish "Districts" for the conduct of the International Union's affairs in various geographically designated areas of the country. These Districts are administrative offices for the conduct of the International Union's affairs and the efficient and uniform implementation of the national collective bargaining agreements. The Districts do not have "members"; nor do they engage in collective bargaining. They are established and exist for the purpose of exercising, in the International Union's name and on the International Union's behalf, such functions as are delegated to them by the International Union. It is essential that the responsibilities delegated to the Districts be carried out strictly in accordance with nationally determined policies. They are merely administrative arms of the International Union. Membership in the International Union exists solely by virtue of membership in a duly chartered local union and there is no "membership" in a District. The members of local unions do not participate in the Districts.

The International President, Vice-President, Secretary-Treasurer, Auditors and Tellers, and all Local Union Officers are elected by secret ballot. All International Executive Board members of the Districts here involved, with the exception of Districts 6 and 7, are chosen by a convention of delegates elected by secret ballot. The International Executive Board member representing District 6 is elected by secret ballot; District 7 is no longer in existence. The members of the National Policy and Scale Committee, which negotiate all collective bargaining agreements, are elected by secret ballot.

As to the power of the District president and secretary-treasurer and their being the administrative agents of the International Union, at each successive Constitutional Convention of the International Union since 1938, there has been adopted concurrently with the adoption of the Constitution a resolution expressly declaring that the Districts are subject to the complete control of the International Union.

As to the history of these Districts, we contend the following facts are undisputed:

District 4

A geographical territory of coke regions in Pennsylvania was originally designated as District 4 by the First Convention of the United Mine Workers of America on January 23-27, 1890. It "ceased to exist" as a District at some time prior to the 1900 Convention. Pursuant to constitutional authority a new provisional District known as District 4,

without autonomy, was created *de novo* in June of 1923. The District was never chartered. It has continued as a provisional District to date and has never possessed autonomy.

District 6

District 6 was established as a provisional District on June 21, 1933. In 1939, District 6 was granted the privilege of election of representatives of the sub-areas of geographical area District 6. The International Executive Board member is also elected. Only the administrative agents of the International Union who are under the direct control of the International officers, to wit, the president and secretary-treasurer of District 6, are appointed.

District 7

District 7, while originally assigned the Ohio territory, became a chartered District of the United Mine Workers of America on April 27, 1903, designated to cover a certain area of the anthracite region of the Pennsylvania coal fields. Its charter was legally revoked by the International Union on October 8, 1941, and a provisional District, without autonomy, was established. On March 20, 1969 District 7 was dissolved and ceased to exist.

District 17

The geographical area of West Virginia was assigned the number of District 17 by the First Convention of the United Mine Workers of America on January 23-27, 1890. It was established on April 1, 1890 by the members in West Virginia. It has never been issued a charter by the International Union. The District possessed autonomy until it was revoked on February 2, 1916. Autonomy was restored to that District on January 1, 1917, only to again be revoked on January 16, 1924. It ceased to exist at that time.

A new provisional District, covering a different geographical area, known as District 17, was established, *de novo*, without autonomy, in June, 1933. It has continued as a provisional District, without autonomy, to date. It has never possessed autonomy.

District 23

District 23 was founded in October, 1892. Its geographical boundaries included all the coal fields of Kentucky, southwest of the Mountain District in Kentucky, and Tennessee, south of Chattanooga. This District has never been chartered by the International Union. It completely ceased to exist on October 21, 1926.

A new provisional District, known as District 23, was created, *de novo*, without autonomy, in 1933. It has continued as a provisional District, without autonomy, to date. It has never possessed autonomy.

District 30

The statement contained in Plaintiff's Pretrial Statement (p. 6) as to the status of District 30 is admitted by the Defendants. In addition, District 30 has never possessed autonomy. It was created pursuant to the Constitution.

District 31

District 31 was chartered on the first day of May, 1926. It was created *de novo* as a provisional District, without autonomy, to tory covered by District 31 never possessed autonomy. It has continued to function as a provisional District, without autonomy, to date.

LEGAL DEFENSES

1. Districts 4, 6, 7, 17, 23, 30 and 31 are not now, nor have they ever been under a trusteeship pursuant to the Act (29 U.S.C. §§ 402(h), 461 and 462). A "trusteeship" is defined as "(h) 'Trusteeship' means any receivership, trusteeship, or other method of supervision or control whereby a labor organization suspends the autonomy otherwise available to a subordinate body under its constitution or bylaws." Except for District

7, these Districts have never had their autonomy suspended.

2. Districts 4, 6, 7, 17, 23, 30 and 31 are not labor organizations within the meaning of the Act (29 U.S.C. § 402(i)); nor are they labor organizations engaged in an industry affecting commerce within the meaning of the Act (29 U.S.C. § 402(j)); nor are they subordinate labor organizations within the meaning of the Act (29 U.S.C. § 461).

3. The present structure of Districts 4, 6, 7, 17, 23, 30 and 31 has been maintained by the International Union for purposes authorized in the Act (29 U.S.C. § 462).

4. With respect to paragraph (c) of the prayers for relief contained in Plaintiff's Complaint, the Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted in that Plaintiff has failed to allege that Defendants are concealing, selling, conveying, transferring, or otherwise disposing of property or assets belonging to pertinent Districts; nor the same will occur.

STIPULATIONS REQUESTED

The following exhibits may be admitted into evidence without proof as to their authenticity:

1. Proceedings of all Constitutional Conventions of the United Mine Workers of America.
2. Minutes of all Meetings of the International Executive Board of the United Mine Workers of America.
3. Constitutions of the International Union, United Mine Workers of America.
4. Charters of any Districts named in the Complaint.
5. All collective bargaining agreements in the coal industry from 1890 to date.
6. All pertinent correspondence of the Defendants and Plaintiff.
7. All financial and audit reports of the International Union.

REQUESTS OF PLAINTIFF

1. List of witnesses, including addresses, shall be furnished, in writing, by Plaintiff, within ten (10) days subsequent to the date of pretrial; and within seventeen (17) days subsequent to the date of pretrial by the Defendants.

2. If Plaintiff intends to offer into evidence, at trial, any depositions of a party or witnesses, Plaintiff shall advise Defendants, in writing, within ten (10) days subsequent to pretrial, of the pertinent portions of said depositions which Plaintiff intends to offer; and Defendants shall, within ten (10) days thereafter, advise Plaintiff, in writing, of what portion of said depositions should also be included.

3. Within fifteen (15) days subsequent to pretrial, Plaintiff shall advise Defendants, in writing, of any request for admissions and answer to interrogatories that Plaintiff intends to offer; and Defendants, within ten (10) days thereafter, will advise Plaintiff to the request for admissions and answers to interrogatories they intend to offer.

EDWARD L. CAREY,
HARRISON COMBS,
WILLARD P. OWENS,
CHARLES L. WIDMAN,
WALTER E. GILLCRIST,
Attorneys for Defendants.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that two copies of the foregoing Defendants' Pretrial Statement were issued, in person, by leaving copies of the same at the office of David Orlikoff, Esquire, United States Department of Justice, Room 3337, Washington, D. C. 20530, Attorney for Plaintiff, this 13th day of January, 1970.

WALTER E. GILLCRIST.

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 material.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. The United States in 1967 produced 1,942,600 metric tons of synthetic rubber. This was 69.1 percent of the world total. Japan was the next leading nation producing 280,600 metric tons.

THE JAPANESE STUDENT MOVEMENT AS SEEN FROM EUROPE

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, with several other colleagues of the House of Representatives and Senate, including Congressman UDALL, of Arizona, and FOLEY, of Washington, I had the privilege last year of participating in the second Japanese-American Assembly in Shimoda.

While in Japan, we had the opportunity to meet and talk with several distinguished leaders in Japanese university life. Among these persons was the Reverend Joseph Roggendorf, S.J., of Sophia University in Tokyo, who has lived in Japan for many years and is widely regarded as one of the leading authorities on Japanese life.

Mr. Speaker, because of our interest in education and our concern about unrest on our own university campuses, we questioned Father Roggendorf about similar problems among Japanese university students. In addition to talking with us, Father Roggendorf presented us an essay he had recently published in the quarterly review, Sophia, entitled "The Japanese Student Movement as Seen From Europe."

Because I believe this article will be of considerable interest to many colleagues, I insert it at this point in the Record:

THE JAPANESE STUDENT MOVEMENT AS SEEN FROM EUROPE

(By Joseph Roggendorf)

I went to Europe this summer convinced that Japanese student unrest was part and parcel of one world-wide movement. Having talked to professors and students at numerous universities in England, France and Germany and having witnessed the escalating violence at Japanese campuses since the end of the summer vacations, I have had to change some of my foregone conclusions. I still believe that the rebellion of the young generation in highly industrialized countries is, basically, a rebellion precisely against the high degree of industrialization itself. I am equally convinced that this emotional revolt is directed against any authority whatsoever and that it is, therefore, intimately connected with the repudiation of religious dogmas, moral conventions, sexual patterns or even sartorial customs. In this sense, the Japanese student movement does appear substantially similar to that in Europe.

Nevertheless, the points of difference are conspicuous. I found it typical that most European youths no longer knew the expression "Zengakuren" which once was a household word, as much as "Zen" with which it was often confused. The helmets of Berlin students and the zig-zag demonstrations of Paris students are credited to Japanese in-

fluence. But I found few traces of a spiritual solidarity, and whatever solidarity there may have been must have evaporated after the wide publicity given in Europe to the horrors of the "Battle of Yasuda Fortress." The events of January 18 and 19 were displayed in detail on television and in the press and occasioned background articles on other particularities of Japanese student terrorists. The resulting shock on public opinion seems to have been considerable, and it affected especially European students, if I am to conclude from letters I received. "I would never have thought that young Japanese can be so callous; my image of Japan has changed," writes a German medical student. "Why do they not call the police at once, when people are tortured or buildings smashed? Has this aversion to do with the Buddhist faith of the Japanese?" writes another. Or a left-leaning student from Paris: "I wish to retract what I told you this summer, viz., that we here sympathize with the young Japanese. I now detest these fake revolutionaries."

THE DIFFERING HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

This summer, the Japanese student movement was rarely mentioned in Europe. In the genealogy of their movement, as European students see it, it all began with the involvement of American students in the civil rights movement in the early 1960s. Feeling their strength, the American students opened resistance to the Vietnam war and to their own university authorities. The great Berkeley upheaval in 1964 produced the phrase "student power." The movement spread to other universities, notably Columbia in New York, and then crossed the Atlantic. The campus struggle in Berlin flamed up in 1965. It was at first concerned with academic issues, but by 1966 the student unions were claiming the right to call and plan political actions. Such actions flared into bloody riots when the Shah of Iran came to Germany as a state guest and was reviled and jeered by groups of students in several cities, principally in Berlin. Then, in March 1968, the leader of the extreme students' group was shot at by a young fanatic. This led to a full-scale explosion of student anger. It also led to an increasingly politically orientated series of actions: mass protests against the "emergency legislation" proposed by parliament (*Notstandsgesetze*: a series of laws to supersede the regulations issued by the occupying powers at the defeat), disturbances at film festivals, book fairs, writers' meetings etc.

EUROPE

At the height of its power, the movement began to infect other European countries. Anarchists styling themselves "provos" (from "provocation") began to immobilize the streets of Amsterdam in 1966 and 1967. Italian students occupied the university buildings in Rome and created trouble in some seven other universities in 1967 and 1968. Italian students were also the first to advocate the thoughts of Chairman Mao and, as they did in Turin, effect some kind of alliance with workers. Only English students kept comparatively quiet although the "Radical Students Alliance" managed a classical uprising at the London School of Economics in March 1967 and has been rather restless ever since.

In France, things went faster and wider than anywhere else. Within a mere week last spring, trouble in the newly built annex of Paris University in Nanterre led to a revolutionary explosion and street fighting. Stages which took months to evolve in Berlin flashed past in days. While the authorities were still studying plans for the abolition or alteration of exams, the rebels and their working-class comrades were calling for the fall of the regime. While the French student rising was the most unexpected, it was also the most frightening for its short duration. But at

the very moment when it seemed to topple the regime and upset the whole of society, de Gaulle staged a spectacular come-back and, at least outwardly, came to look stronger than before. Meanwhile a thorough revamping of the university system is being carried out by the new de Gaulle cabinet, and comparable profound reforms are carried out in Germany and Italy as well.

Even so brief a summary suggests at once one conspicuous difference in the student movements in Europe and in Japan. Unrest in Japan has been going on for more than a decade, flaring up here and there, then abating again, fitful, whimsical, but on the whole growing more dangerous. What is an acute disease in Europe has been a chronic malady in Japan. At the same time, all the unrest has effected little by way of university reform in Japan, whereas in Europe the brief and spectacular outbursts are leading to decisive changes in the university structure. The theories of European student ideologies are now being studied in Japan and accentuate its anarchic aspects. But the starting point itself was essentially different in Europe.

Student discontent in both Germany and France began from grievances with the university, although, no doubt, it did not stop there. When listening to the complaints of students on overcrowded classrooms, stand-offish professors, shortage of books and equipment, indefinitely protracted years of study, one could not help wondering why an explosion had not set in earlier. The Germans resent the quasi-authoritarian powers of the "ordinarius" i.e., holder of the principal chair (*kôza*), the French the rigidly bureaucratic centralization. Both insist on more rapid expansion of the system. One cannot escape the impression that the Western European university, while rightly proud of immense achievements over the centuries, is encrusted in tradition and has remained, for too long a time, unwilling to adjust its outmoded concept of elite to the changing times of mass democracy. It is worth noting at this point that the tradition encrusting German and French universities is, at best, only one and a half centuries old. English universities, based on much older medieval patterns, reveal far more humaneness and resilience than the 19th century models which, at the time, looked so much more modern.

CONFUSED ISSUES IN JAPAN

When inquiring about Japan, Europeans are surprised that conditions are in many ways the opposite to their own. While in Europe the number of universities is woefully inadequate and increases only painfully at the rate of a new university or so a year, in Japan universities have sprung up by several hundred since the war. European students have to postpone their graduation, for lack of guidance and research facilities, while in many Japanese universities the way to graduation is as automatic as promotion in a corporation (*nenko joretsu*). Upon being asked about student unrest at Sophia University, I reported dissatisfaction with certain campus rules.

"Surely, as a religiously oriented school, you impose too many restrictions," I was asked by students in Munich.

I replied that we have no compulsory Bible classes or religious services, no regulations on the shortness of skirts or the length of hair and beards, but that we insist on certain restrictions concerning uninhibited political group activity. At that point in the conversation it became necessary to explain at length a phenomenon totally unknown to European students, viz., the fact that in Japan students carry out their extracurricular activities in club rooms furnished gratis by the university on its overcrowded campus. Even my rather left-leaning interlocutors failed to see why certain regulations in this case should incense their Japanese comrades.

"But what are the proper university matters they are complaining about," they would ask.

To this question I was not able to give a clearcut answer. The fact is, of course, that there are plenty of things at Japanese universities to complain about. But the most startling feature about Japanese student agitation is that the basic absurdities of the university system are rarely mentioned. For the last fifteen years they have demonstrated vigorously against issues about which they simply cannot be properly informed, mostly their country's foreign policy. At the same time the students' preoccupation with foreign affairs is narrow-minded and one-sided to the point of silliness. They are understandably excited about the Vietnam disaster, as are students all over the world, and in a parrot-like way keep denouncing the Security Treaty. But there is no student protest against Soviet encroachment on Japanese territory, Chinese nuclear experiments, the rape of Czechoslovakia, the genocide in Biafra.

PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES

At any rate, no meaningful criticism is directed by the ultras against abuses in the university. One does not see demonstrations bringing to the attention of the nation the glaring injustice of discrimination against private universities. Europeans who have no notion of properly private universities are scandalized when they hear that the taxpayers' money goes to a few well-equipped and well-staffed national schools which monopolize the avenues to the best employment, while 70% of the taxpayers' children attend tax-unsupported private universities. The Japanese "university examination hell" is proverbial even in Europe. That the feverish competition for entrance into the coveted school must lead to nervous disorders, from overwork in those who succeed, and from frustration in those who fail, does arouse compassion in Europe but no indignation among Japanese students.

Indeed, on visiting one European university after another—many of them, no doubt, old-fashioned, but all of them deeply embedded in a sound educational infrastructure (family and school) still widely intact—I myself came to have a new compassion for the Japanese student. Compared to the far more settled and far less basically disturbed moral climate of Europe, I often felt as if I understood why frustration in this country is so frequently articulated in a manner that, at first sight, seems irrelevant. There is so little talk about university reform because, while, no doubt, much is wrong with the university, yet the students feel an existential frustration that far surpasses the university problem as such.

Is not much of their precious adolescence wasted in intense cramming to enter into a university, while, after having entered, no new purpose in life appears since he passively passes from here on as seaweed jelly (*tokoroten*) squeezed through a tube? The mere need to recuperate a lost adolescence may lead to play the pranks suitable for a much younger age. I recall the unknown man at Shinjuku Station who tipsily tapped me on the shoulder as I stood watching a frantic fund-raising scene and said, "That's the students' recreation."

The noisy rampaging of students these days can, of course, not easily be shrugged off as "recreation." The look in the hollow eyes of many a haranguing student agitator can be so desperate as to suggest that his feelings are not really related to the incongruous sounds he utters. Much as, according to Wordsworth, there are "thoughts too deep for tears," so there must be an anguish too profound for the microphone.

JAPANESE STUDENT GRIEVANCES

Certainly the grievances of Japanese students—as far as they have to do with the university—are out of all proportion to their

actions. For months on end, school buildings are smashed or disfigured, teachers and classmates manhandled, neighborhoods intimidated. Firebombs, chemicals, stones and glass are thrown against each other, or against the police which (in contrast to Europe) is not armed, and the reason? Raise of tuition fee, refusal to hand over administration of buildings, disagreement on priority in campus expansion, opposition to removal, protest against financial mismanagement or—surely the silliest of all pretexts for rebellion ever invoked by students—police detectives investigating a case of theft reported by the students themselves as happened at Sophia University. Such issues one cannot mention abroad for fear of making Japanese students look silly. Indeed, they are not the issues at all. Behind them is a profound malaise with contemporary society as such. But exploiting both the silly concrete issues and the general malaise there is a dedicated and well-trained core of professional activists. These activists do not want removal of grievances. They demand something they know in advance that the university cannot yield, then scream bloody murder when it is not delivered. It is the confrontation, not the issues which they consider important.

STRATEGY OF AGITATION

The strategy of professional agitators to exploit innocuous grievances for their own revolutionary purposes is not a phenomenon confined to Japan. But it has been demasked as a treacherous trick much more thoroughly in Europe than in Japan. In Europe one does, of course, not consider invoking the help of police an efficient remedy in all disturbances, let alone a remedy ideally suited to solve a campus problem. Yet, European public opinion would simply not endorse the tabu elaborately erected in Japan that bans police from universities in all circumstances. A certain allergy against police on the campus is to some extent understandable when one thinks of the excesses of the thought police before the war. But why is precisely that generation which has no direct experience of the pre-war nightmare so morbidly opposed to the present police force which, in the opinion of many Europeans, behaves as reasonably as that of England? Is not the answer that the young generation derives most of their information on the history and social structure of modern Japan from writers and lecturers with a doctrinaire bias? Ideologists, not thinkers, have predominated in post-war Japan. Issues have thus been simplified, opinions polarized, slogans have been substituted for ideas. The morbid distrust of any kind of state authority is a result of ideological indoctrination of long standing.

Only slowly is public opinion waking up to the realization that the rioting students seriously intend to carry out what they have always avowed, namely subvert the existing order. This realization has come much later it did in Germany and France. And even now it is still widely believed in Japan that a little more friendliness or a little more dialogue will bring the rebels back to the fold. The university authorities, so it is believed, must only yield on a few points—revoking punishment, relaxing rules, surrendering property, suspending professors—and order will be restored. The universities are wrong, not the rioting students and their hidden manipulators—that is also the impression which part of the news media has fostered. To quote only two examples where I can check the facts since my own university is unjustly criticized. *Gendai no Me* quotes as proof against the university evidence in a law suit submitted by a disgruntled former staff member, but does not even mention that this evidence was rejected by the court. Or *Asahi Journal* trying to depict this University as manipulated from abroad vastly

exaggerates the number of its foreign staff and falsely alleges that the chairman of the board of trustees is appointed by the Vatican.

THE POLITICIZATION OF THE UNIVERSITY

That students engage in political action is a phenomenon usually associated with underdeveloped countries. Student riots have indeed led to the fall of governments in Korea, Turkey, Indonesia, Latin-America, indeed even, with the active connivance of one part of the state authorities against another, in Communist China. In the industrially advanced countries behind the Iron Curtain, students' protests were brutally suppressed, in the liberal societies of the Western world students' protests were for a long time canalized into existing political parties. Japan was historically the first example of a developed nation producing a politically vociferous student movement opposed to government and opposition alike. Meanwhile student groupings have become politically colored all over the Western world and they have, or so it would seem, become as pronouncedly anti-parliamentarian as the anti-Yoyogi Zengakuren has been for years.

It was, therefore, with particular interest that I attended a lecture and subsequent debate on the vision of a coming society arranged by a group of ultra-left students in Berlin this summer.

The speaker, a student of political science, spoke in the specialized jargon of modern sociology. But the audience of about 200 apparently did not mind the language which I found excessively abstract. They eagerly listened, applauding an occasional vehement denunciation of the authorities. When the lecture was over the audience exploded into a debate which went on for another two hours. They had given the speaker a fair chance to explain himself. But having listened, they tore his arguments to pieces. Not many in the audience had been convinced.

The gist of the speaker's lecture can be found in a book by J. Agnoli, like the speaker of that evening a graduate school student at the Otto-Suhr Institut of political science in Berlin; (*Die Transformation der Demokratie*) and in the publications of other scholars mostly of the universities of Berlin and Frankfurt such as Habermas, Brocher, Adorno. The principal thesis as expounded that evening can be summed up as the necessity of destroying representative democracy in favor of a direct democracy, a Räte-demokratie (*kyōgikai minshushugi*). The ruling bourgeois oligarchies seek to prevent the masses from effectively participating in the political process. They do this now no longer by applying the discredited methods of fascism, but rather by transforming the democratic institutions themselves. Much as the authoritarian structure of industrial enterprises in the U.S.A. has been made palatable to the wage earners by new techniques of "human relationship," so the whole of society is to be manipulated by flattering the prestige and inciting the consumption desires of the public. The real purpose behind the drives to rationalize production and increase consumption is exactly the same as that behind the fascist oppressions of old, viz., to numb the perception of those wronged by the existing distribution of power. A climate of social peace is artificially created in which injustice and oppression are no longer felt, so that both social antagonism and political opposition fade away by themselves. The antagonism of classes is denied by the establishment. Admitted is only the necessary peaceful co-existence of diverse interests in the sphere of consumption, so that the actual monopoly in the sphere of production is effectively obfuscated.

DEMOCRACY

Parliamentary democracy thus reveals itself as a sham. Instead of defending freedom

it betrays it. Alienation results from the hypocrisy of the system: the people are made to feel "represented" by their parliamentary deputies, while in reality they are "manipulated." What is needed is to let the people speak for themselves without middle-man.

Dissent with the speaker concentrated on two principal points: 1) direct democracy would lead to greater evils than the present system, as was pointed out with reference to modern French and German history (the Paris commune, the München Räterepublik), 2) class conflict was no longer a reality in industrial Germany, and the feeling of the young of being manipulated could not be overcome merely by changing political processes.

I sat around till late that night with a group of these students. I found it exhilarating to listen to a lively debate on the hottest issues of society and politics between upholders of the most differing opinions. I have had this experience repeatedly on European campuses. It is, at least at the moment, not easily obtainable in a Japanese university. Here students of the same sect either huddle together, or else they threateningly shout at their opponents. At the very moment when communication has become more needed than at any point in recent history, it has broken down most completely.

POINTS IN COMMON

Nevertheless, there are also many points in common between European and Japanese students as one sits around with them. Like the Japanese, they feel a disgust for which they have no name. Is it the horror of the gigantic machinery into which civilization is turning, with the individual an anonymous, powerless cog? Or the fear of two superpowers, glaring at each other from behind their nuclear and atomic armaments, yet both unable to give reasonable peace and freedom even to their own populations? There is also an unbridgeable gap between generations. Indeed, in few other countries is the experience of one generation as radically different from the other as in Germany and Japan. It is hard for an older German or Japanese to convey to his son what it was to have been enmeshed in the horrors of a totalitarian regime and in the misery and despair of its defeat. And it is equally hard for a young German or Japanese to visualize that the utopia he impetuously wants will bring about once more the tyranny which the fathers are accused of having tolerated in the past.

I am sure theoretical discussions on the nature of a better society to come are carried out in this country too, perhaps at the various headquarters of anti-Yoyogi factions, in Ikebukuro, Jimbōchō, Misakichō, Nakano or Asagaya. But certainly not at the universities. Japanese universities are turning into extraterritorial sanctuaries, where the walls are plastered with threatening slogans and where activists terrorize their professors and classmates, sporadically to sally forth and terrorize the nation. The utopian desire for direct democracy has degenerated into the demand for the lynch court of "mass confrontation" (*taishū dankō*).

THE DISILLUSION WITH MARXISM

On the surface, the Japanese student movement has retained its long-standing obsession with the alleged evils of monopoly capitalism, American imperialism, bourgeois fascism. Meanwhile the disintegration of Marxism as an international force has become an irrefutable fact. Not only has the once coherent movement broken down into feuding factions, it begins to exhibit signs of big-power-arrogance, exploitation, bureaucracy and, indeed, of imperialistic aggressiveness. Old Boys of the Zengakuren movement often remark with nostalgia that they cannot understand the present genera-

tion of militants. They forget that they too meanwhile are supposed to belong to some hated establishment. But the most decisive thing that has happened meanwhile is that the old Marxist creed itself has totally changed. Helmets, staffs and towels are more than a new male fashion. They indicate a change of spirit. The revolution is, in the mind of the militants, about to happen. It is no longer carefully to be plotted under the strict guidance of an established Socialist or Communist Party or the international federation of such parties. Accordingly the ferocious slogans which to Old Boys of the movement have the same familiar ring, have assumed a different meaning. Communism has failed, but while their elders turn away in despair from Marxist-inspired parties, the young pretend to have discovered a new Marxism which at last assigns to the students the role of the revolutionary vanguard. Marxism has become Marcuseanism.

Whether the thought of Prof. Marcuse has causally influenced the thinking of Japanese student militants to a decisive extent is an academic question of little import. The fact is that his ideas have by now penetrated into the activists' little guidance magazines and hence their wall papers and slogans. And the American professor's power of mischiefmaking should not be underestimated. Already when still a much younger man and while still a German national he was, in 1930 and 1931, admired among the angry young men of that time as one of the most categorical opponents of the Weimar Republic. His hatred of German democracy bore fruit if, by historical irony, not in the manner in which he predicated it. He wished for the victory of the extreme Left, but the extreme Right won out.

MARCUSE

Marcuse's analysis of present society begins where the anti-Yoyogi movement also begins, at the spectacle of international socialism gone bankrupt. He traces the collapse of organized Marxism first to an initial failure of Lenin. In Marx's view the increasing pauperization of the proletariat was bound to lead by historical necessity to the inevitable switch from a capitalist to a socialist organization of society. The communist party had only the role of a midwife in assisting the birth of the new order, but the inevitable change itself would, of course, only occur in a highly developed capitalist society. Lenin disregarded this basic point. It was the party itself which created a revolutionary situation in backward Russia and there arose of necessity an authoritarian state, characterized by rigid class differences, an almighty bureaucracy and an omnipresent police.

But while history proved Marx right in one point, it proved him wrong in another. The facts, as we know them by now, are that industrial progress has led not to the increased pauperization but to the increased well-being of the working-class. Where Marx thought that the workers had "nothing to lose but their chains," they now have everything to lose. They refuse to see things changed; they do not want a revolution.

A dilemma results: either the conditions of production are ripe for a revolution, but the revolutionary sentiment is missing; or else the objective conditions are missing but the revolutionary elan of a few is there and, if they take power, the stage is set for despotism, in other words for another long road towards Stalinism.

Marcuse advocates a way out of the dilemma. And the new way he advocates is as utopian as the future society he visualizes, a world without misery, ugliness, oppression, indeed without toil. Since in the existing establishments whether capitalist or socialist the revolutionary mood is lacking, it has to be created. This is to be carried through by "the residuum of the discriminated and outsiders; the exploited and persecuted of all races and all colors, the unemployed and

unemployable." Three groups are alluded at: racial minorities; the elements usually termed "asocial" such as mentally unfit persons and criminals; and the students. The more racially homogeneous and economically affluent a society is, the less important are the first two groups and the more important will be student power, especially since students by number alone come to constitute an ever larger segment of prospering societies. It is, therefore, especially the students of Western Europe and Japan that feel themselves appealed to by the Marcusean doctrine. They create a revolutionary elan by defying authority on any issue whatever. For "law and order" are nothing but the arbitrarily set up rules of a game played by the establishment to perpetuate its oppression. When its own rules are flouted by violent protests or ironical contempt, the establishment reacts by way of brutal repression thus demasking itself as potentially despotic or "fascist," and ever larger groups of the people will rally round the rebel leaders united in the will to smash the existing regime.

What happens after the destruction? Marcuse does not say, indeed cannot say, as he admits, since "no terms are available to express the society of tomorrow." He foresees as a first step to a new order an "educational dictatorship" which he recognizes as "a terrible risk," a risk, however, which "cannot be more terrible than the risk incurred by the existing liberal and authoritarian societies."

EUROPEAN DISILLUSIONMENT

The European students to whom I spoke this summer have widely lost their interest in Marcuse. He disappointed them in his doctrinaire and arrogant way when he came to Europe for lectures. Furthermore, the contradictions in his thought are too obvious and have become more barefaced as ultra-leftwing factions such as SDS (German Socialist Students) have come to put Marcusean ideas into practice. After all, far from being a "class," the students turn out not to be a coherent group in any definable sense. They are neither capable of unified responsibility for their own university—since they have just joined it, or will soon leave it—nor for society at large, since they have not even entered it. This interior contradiction between loudly asserted aims and in practicable realization produces the neurosis characteristic of Marcuse-disciples in Europe. It leads to their increasingly senseless destructiveness, and thus to their increasing isolation. In Germany, at any rate, their actions, however haphazard and insignificant if compared to student action here, have become more and more desperate. And to crown their frustration: the "establishment," instead of collapsing, begins to rally round and reform itself.

Seen from Europe, the anti-Yoyogi factions look like model Marcuse-disciples. Their total disregard for right and truth in the name of subjecthood (*shutaisei*), their inflammatory and irrational language of "specialty slave" (*semmon dorci*), "alliance of learning and industry" (*sangaku kyōdō*) or "everlasting struggle" (*eikyūteki kyōtō*), all that sounds as if taken from Marcuse's textbook. And, like the sour old man himself, these militants in Japan are devoid of any kind of humor. At the same time, Marcuseanism shows so far, no sign of abating in Japan.

NEOMARXISM IN JAPAN

One reason for the continued neo-Marxist fever in Japan may be connected with the presence of an orthodox Marxist movement among Japanese students, lavishly financed and cleverly organized by the Japanese Communist Party, the "Democratic Youth Federation of Japan" (Nihon Minshushugi Seinen Dōmei or Minseidō). This is a phenomenon unique to Japan and without parallel anywhere in the world. Even the powerful

and rich communist parties of France and Italy have long lost any influence on the students. It must be a thorn in the flesh of ultra-leftists in Japan to see the sacred names of Marx and Lenin abused by a party establishment that is more rigid and inhuman than any capitalist establishment now in existence. The Japanese Communist Party has lost the lustre of its heroic resistance against the fascist oppression during Taishō and early Shōwa. After many betrayals and opportunistic manoeuvres, it has turned into a well-lubricated, highly efficient bureaucratic machine. With gaudy propaganda trucks, neatly printed handbills, well-paid agents, lavishly provided food and weapons it tries to pose as a power for order and renovation on Japan's campuses. In reality it only aims at the deepening of hostilities to further its own subversive ends. Its hypocrisy naturally angers the mass of the student body.

One more reason for the unchanging appeal of Marx to so many Japanese students is, perhaps, that, ever since Taishō, Marxism has been to many Japanese intellectuals not a system of thought and action critically examined and apprehended, but a secular faith fervently embraced and fanatically defended against dissenters. Only the deep-seated indifference of many educated Japanese to traditional religion, be it native or alien, quite explains the mystical hold of old or new Marxism on the student mind. A spiritual vacuum is being filled which, one cannot help noticing, is bigger than it is in Europe. At the same time, there are antidotes ready in the European organism which Japan, with a different intellectual history, has not quite developed.

JAPANESE SOCIETY

Finally one cannot compare the student situation in Japan and in Europe without pointing to characteristics of the Japanese social structure. Society in Japan is held together by a framework of *giri* and *ninjō* (social convention and humane feeling), by considerations of decorum, human respect, face, by the desire to avoid open clashes and rather seek a modus vivendi by compromise. Abstract terms such as individuality, conscience, justice, law, notions on which Japan's modern institutions are based, are expressed in neologisms coined barely a hundred years ago. They are not quite as operative as they should be in an industrial and democratic society. The militant student who breaks away from such a conformist society begins by repudiating its whole frame work of behavior. He replaces the elaborate honorifics of the Japanese language by purposely offensive speech patterns of his own, using, to address a teacher, such vulgar forms as "temē" or "kisama", or constantly repeating such crude expressions as "nonsense" or *jikohihan* (self-criticism) which go against the first rule of Japanese behavior, viz., that "inconvenience" (*meiwaku*) must be avoided.

At the same time, radical leftists are liable to retire into a *giri-ninjō* web of their own. And here is perhaps the reason why the innumerable anti-Yoyogi factions resemble so startlingly the organizations of thugs in the feudal age and the present, the *ninja*, *sōshi*, *yakuza* and similar traditional outlaw groups. The power of coherence and of endurance, the ruthlessness of the *oyabun-kobun* (boss and henchmen) system, the need for perpetual infights to establish or preserve hegemony, the antics of heroism, the refusal or, indeed, the inability to discuss issues, the addiction to mannerisms, in speech and conduct, the fascination exerted on a certain type of woman—these features are neither new in Japanese society, nor are they confined to left-wing students. I am sure, many young people find in these sectarian groupings some of that warmth and dedication of which so little is left in the contemporary industrial society. They may believe in a type of new society which it is

impossible to achieve, viz., a society refusing all the works of technology, a pre-scientific society. Yet firmness of their faith, the invincibility of their hope, their superhuman asceticism—how many of them do without three meals a day, or without a bath—are like the resurrection of long-forgotten virtues.

Yet the aspects of an anti-social criminality are equally undeniable. The ruthlessness with which they can beat up a comrade trying to leave their ranks, the cruelty with which they torture their enemies, their contemptuous disrespect for anyone else's property, or good will, or integrity—these remind one of the darker pages in recent history. One such reminder of the 2-2-6 *jiken* I saw clearly written the other day on the walls of Sophia University, after the barricades were taken down: *Ichinin issatsu* ("Everyone kill one"), the infamous catchword of pre-war ultrarightists.

I do not want to convey the impression that the student situation is of necessity worse here than abroad. If the situation in Japan has, until now, been characterized by a systematic disregard for legality, both government and general opinion are also suddenly becoming aware of their laxity. Both the enforcement of law and the proposal of reforms long overdue are at last proceeding. On the other hand, there are a number of factors that aggravate the student problem in Europe in ways fortunately absent here—the tendency of Germans to theorize and produce disturbing philosophies far more destructive than emotional outbursts—the tendency of the French to dramatize and create extreme situations that leave no exit—the tendency of the English to opt out of a society they dislike, either into passive immorality or into quiet emigration to Australia, Canada, America.

LAW, FREEDOM, PARTICIPATION

In so far as student unrest in Japan signifies the wholesale rejection of the existing value system, it is difficult to think of any position except the resolute decision to defend the will of the majority by all means legally available. The mere will of a few to destroy can only be resisted, it cannot be overcome by compromise. And this proposition holds true about the student rioters in Western Europe as well as Japan. In fact, these would-be revolutionaries do not expect either compromise, or dialogue, or participation, and this again is true both of Europe and Japan. The following remarks by Alfred Rapp, a German critic, could be applied, as they stand, to Japan:

"There is no taboo they would not break. The only taboo not to be broken is the taboo-breaker himself. They may question everything, but they themselves must not be questioned. Whoever contradicts them, is a petty bourgeois, a reactionary, a lackey of monopoly capitalism. They love to play the role of the oppressed, while they themselves are the oppressors, maligning, damning, persecuting whoever does not share their dogmas on revolution. If you say 'No' to everything you are one of them. If you say 'Yes', e.g. to the question that not everything is wrong with the Federal Republic, you are excommunicated, as was Günther Grass."

It would be easy to substitute the name of Japanese progressive intellectuals for that of the progressive German novelist here alluded to.

It sounds little constructive not to have to offer any solution for the treatment of the revolutionary student cadres except isolating them. Yet the recent history especially of Germany and Japan offers sufficient proof that the temptation to pacify destructive radicals must be overcome, unless national suicide result. When I left Germany in Shōwa 10, two years after Hitler had taken over, many Germans were saying about the young Nazi movement what, upon arriving

here, Japanese would say about the radical young officers (*seinen shōkō*) of the time: "One cannot approve of all their methods, still they mean well." And it is what one hears again in both countries, this time about anti-democratic rebels from the Left. Then as now this is said by critics, journalists, professors who are convinced they have understood the signs of the time. Is it, because democracy is still young in both our countries, or is it, because we both once succumbed to right-wing totalitarianism, that we are both blind to the totalitarianism of the Left? A peculiar instance of a certain intellectual blindness some young Germans have in common with young Japanese is the phenomenon of revolutionarily engaged Christians. The "fighting Christians" (*Tatakau Christosha*) or "Catholic Struggle Committees" (*Catholic tōsōi*) have their parallel in the "Political Night Prayer" of students in Cologne. The group was reprimanded by the Catholic Archbishop, and the Protestant Bishop compared them in a statement with the infamous group of "Deutsche Christen" who, under Hitler, tried to reconcile Nazi racialism with Christianity. As did the Hitler Christians then, the ultra-leftist Christians now mingle religion with politics, advocate the violent overthrow of society and openly preach hatred and violence—certainly not exactly the teaching of the Gospel.

To refuse to deal with ultra-left radicals however, need not mean an exclusively negative attitude. The radical leaders themselves are not in the slightest interested in university reform. However, their success—greater in Japan than in Europe—in mobilizing sympathizers proves that something must be wrong with the university as it now stands. Seen from Europe, what course for improvement may be suggested?

THE COURSE OF IMPROVEMENT

Generally speaking, certain lines of reform ought to be easier to carry through here than there. The reform movements in both France and Germany are suffering from immense organizational handicaps; in France, there is no longer a tradition of university autonomy because of an omnipotent central bureaucracy, in Germany, on the other hand, no nationally coherent plan can be carried out because of the federal structure of the country which excludes a national Ministry of Education. Organizational difficulties in Japan are of an entirely different nature. The term "*daigaku*" in this country has, since the end of the war, come to assume altogether too loose a meaning. A diversification in both substance and nomenclature will certainly have to be introduced and, as a consequence, there will have to be adjustments in the middle and high school structure so that finally the university entrance examination can at last rationally be overhauled. The glaring differences in treating public and private universities must also, for the sake of justice, be overcome. Cannot the tuition fees be made identical at all universities and a truly generous scholarship system be installed? If private universities were better supported, they could also more easily live up to their obligations. They would be forced to stick by the rules—such as strictly observing numerous clauses and enrollment conditions, as well as complete fairness in admission and graduation—and thus reduce the evil of mass education. This would not mean infringing on their autonomy. On the contrary, legal enforcement of a minimum of order is a precondition for the freedom of research and teaching which is academic autonomy.

THE REAL GRIEVANCES

As one walks around the campuses of Europe and Japan, one gains the impression that the real grievances of most students have little to do with either the battlecries of militant radicals or even some of the re-

form plans of the authorities. The average student may not be able to articulate his desires by way of an abstract blueprint. But he does have the vaguely uneasy feeling that society is changing far more rapidly than his school. He grieves that, at the very moment when he—himself a child of the newly emerging society—ought to have more of a say in his own education, he has really less, since the student population explosion turns him into a nameless member of a mass. It is thus that the problem of student participation has come to be placed into the center of reform proposals in France, Germany and Japan.

It goes without saying that the ultras refuse even to consider such proposals. French students cynically conjugate the verb "*participer*": *Je participe, tu participes, il participe, nous participons, vous participez, ils exploitent.* They, as well as their radical comrades elsewhere, want a university entirely run by themselves, a university commune. Nothing short of the destruction of the whole system will satisfy them. To talk to them is fruitless.

Nevertheless, there is a real problem. Without some kind of student participation the malaise of the university cannot be cured. It is not that the student body has suddenly become restless and its whims have to be placated. It is rather that, with the impact of the Second Industrial Revolution, the temper of an age has changed with a thoroughness and rapidity unprecedented in history. One can only think of the experience of our remote ancestors when they switched from the roaming life of hunters and gatherers to the sedentary occupation of farmers. To try to adapt to an entirely new rhythm of existence without the support of those most immediately aware of the *Zeitgeist*, i.e., the young, would be presumptuous in the extreme.

But precisely because the atmosphere of life in highly industrialized countries has become transformed overnight, the danger of over-hasty precipitation in granting participation cannot be denied. The position of violent revolutionaries and of panicking reformers can come to resemble each other. Both would bring about a state of permanent conflict, at the very time when calm and reason are needed most. Nothing was more widely debated on European campuses this summer than this issue. I remember especially a lengthy talk with Mr. Ulrich Lohmar, a Socialist Member of Parliament and Chairman of the University Reform Committee of the Bonn Bundestag.

STUDENTS IN DECISION-MAKING

Mr. Lohmar considered especially pernicious the widely debated proposal of having students represented on all levels of decision making, and in the ratio of 5:5, or, with instructors, assistants and employees, of 3:3:3. He considered it characteristic of present trends that, while students want to participate in universities even on levels hitherto reserved to professors, students themselves insist on excluding the rest of the university from all their activities. Excessive participation leads, according to Lohmar, to two kinds of abuse. On the one hand, the functional differentiation between the various constituents of the university comes to be denied. Functions are not interchangeable regardless of knowledge and experience. Lenin once boasted of building a State which "any charwoman could run." Neither he nor anybody else tried to put this dream into practice, and for the same reason students or employees, including technical assistants, cannot simply be equalled with professors in most university matters. A second inevitable consequence of ruthlessly applied participation would be, in Lohmar's mind, a new type of "Ivory tower" university. Old-fashioned liberal professors would unite with radical students to demand absolute au-

thority against the State. The university would end up by considering the process of decision making as a political process to be carried out outside parliament. Thus the will of the public which supports the university and depends on it, would come to be disregarded and the university would become a State within the State.

Many university men in Europe seem to fear that, if the ratio of professors either on the All-University Council or on the Department Council shrank to one-half or one-third, the whole university would become more rigid rather than more flexible. The professors would always endeavor to stick together against the other groups rather than siding occasionally with differing opinions. They would also try to employ assistants on the criterion of obedience and devotedness rather than adaptability and open-mindedness. In order to ensure all people concerned to be heard, yet to prevent interminable talking (*Dauerpalaver*), the ratio of professors 8, assistants 2, students 1 is widely advocated in Germany, but only for such councils where students have some semblance of competence.

Such views do not of necessity represent those of the younger generation. Yet, it is a remarkable fact that, as soon as student participation is introduced, the interest of the general students body visibly begins to wane. Less than half the students at those universities where there is a degree of participation cast their vote for students' representatives. Thus at West Berlin University in December 1968, after considerable concessions had been made on student participation, radicals conducted a triumphant campaign: result 41% vote (previously 65%), ultra 52, non-ultra 24 (formerly 26-50). The result is that the most radical students obtain a disproportionate share of the votes. It is for this reason that the new French reform plans specify 60% of the student vote as necessary for the validity of any election, while in certain Latin American republics it is being considered to make voting obligatory.

INACTION NO ANSWER

The planned lawlessness on European as well as Japanese campuses will not peter out on its own; it will not wreck the whole of society, but it may well paralyze the university itself unless it is stopped by means which the university itself does not possess. This principle is understood in Europe and, at last, is coming to be understood in Japan.

But the legitimate dissatisfaction of the majority of students can ultimately be solved through the readiness of both partners to talk to each other and devise new ways of coping with new emergencies. Student ineptitude, provocation and violence can strengthen the voice of the hawks and push the political center of gravity powerfully to the right. On the other hand, the rights and well-being of too many people are at stake to allow violence to pass unchecked. To avoid both extremes is the task of confronting the university in East and West. If they are avoided, it ought to be possible to pass beyond certain authoritarian and paternalistic assumptions still inhering in our society and work out ways to adapt the university to the demands of a new complicated age.

THE NATIONAL FOREST TIMBER CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1969

(Mr. KASTENMEIER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act, popularly called the National Timber Supply Act, which

we are considering now, is one of the most clearly anticonservation bills ever to come before the House.

The basic purpose of this legislation is to substantially increase the timber yield from the forest lands on our national forests. The rationale given us for this measure is that the present housing shortage is caused by a short supply and the rising prices of lumber, both of which can be corrected by increasing the national forest cut. We do have a housing crisis. The annual rate of new housing starts has dropped from 2 million units to less than 1.2 million. However, the housing shortage is due more to high interest rates than a scarce supply of lumber and high timber prices. The supply of lumber appears adequate for the time being, so much so that 4 billion board feet were exported last year. Furthermore, lumber prices currently are depressed, having fallen as fast as they rose earlier.

In actuality, this legislation will result in an accelerated exploitative destruction of our remaining old growth forests and an abandonment of the principles of sustained yield. Under this bill, all timber land that is capable of commercial production will be allocated for that purpose, with the exception of those lands already reserved for other purposes.

Simply stated, this National Timber Supply Act will negate the multiple-use principle which governs the management of our national forests by assigning top priority to one specific interest, logging, thus ignoring the fact that these forests are important not only as a source of lumber but also, for other uses, such as watershed protection, flood prevention, soil and wildlife conservation, recreational purposes, and esthetic refuges. All these interests are adversely affected when sustained yield practices are cast aside for accelerated timber harvesting. This measure is just going to let the lumber companies, including some who have not been practicing the most intelligent utilization of their private holdings, loot our national forests.

Mr. Speaker, the American people rightfully are concerned about the future of our natural resources, and they are expressing this concern more vigorously than they ever have in the past. It would be ironic for Congress to begin the environmental decade with the passage of a measure so completely detrimental to good conservation principles and the public interest. We have the obligation to protect our national forests, not only for the present generation of Americans, but, also, for generations yet to come. This legislation is not needed, and I urge its rejection.

COUNTIES RANK HIGH IN FARM INCOME

(Mr. BEVILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, four of the 12 counties which make up the Seventh Congressional District, the district which I am honored to serve, have placed

among the 10 top Alabama counties in farm income. Three of these counties, Cullman, De Kalb, and Marshall, were recorded one, two, three in farm income during the past year. Blount County was seventh.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud of the achievements these counties have made, and of the contributions they have made to their Nation.

In this era of declining farms, it is heartening to see what progress these counties have made. Agriculture prosperity is, in my judgment, essential to national prosperity.

I am placing in the RECORD a recent newspaper article which tells the story of Alabama's farm income and lists the leading counties.

CULLMAN IS NO. 1 IN FARM INCOME

For the sixth straight year Cullman County has placed number one among Alabama counties in farm income. De Kalb County was number two.

The gross was \$42.1 million in Cullman and \$37.6 million in De Kalb, according to estimates released at Auburn University today.

Marshall County's \$27.8 million was enough to rank it third, the spot Madison held last year.

The other seven counties ranking highest and the income of each (in millions of dollars) were Madison \$26.6; Mobile \$23.1; Baldwin \$22.4; Blount \$22.2; Lawrence \$20.5; Jackson \$19.7; and Limestone \$19.3.

The figures were compiled from estimates of county Extension chairmen, explained Allen Brown, Extension Service marketing specialist at Auburn University. The figures include income from the sale of all crops and livestock, income from farm, commercial, state and national forest sales, and income from government payments.

Overall, the state's 1969 gross farm income has been estimated at \$896 million. That's \$131 million better than in 1968 and \$213 million above the 1967 total.

Brown's report also ranked counties according to gross income by commodities. The top five in each of the state's major commodities, with income listed in millions of dollars, were:

Beef Cattle—Sumter \$5.9; Dallas \$5.9; Madison \$5.8; Marengo \$5.8; Montgomery \$5.6.

Broilers—Cullman \$22.7; Winston \$13.6; Walker \$13.5; De Kalb \$11.4; Marshall \$11.1. Cash Grain (including corn)—Jackson \$4.4; De Kalb \$3.2; Marshall \$2.3; Crenshaw \$1.8; Limestone \$1.7.

Cotton—Madison \$9.7; Limestone \$8.4; Lawrence \$6.8; Marshall \$4.9; De Kalb \$4.4. Dairying—Montgomery \$4.5; Baldwin \$3.5; Shelby \$3.2; Hale \$3; Perry \$2.5.

Eggs—Blount \$9.5; De Kalb \$9.3; Cullman \$5.5; St. Clair \$4.3; Shelby \$4.2.

Fruits and vegetables—Chilton \$3.6; Blount \$2.9; Baldwin \$2.8; De Kalb \$2.6; Jackson \$2.2.

Hogs—De Kalb \$3.1; Jackson \$2.8; Covington \$2.8; Houston \$2.8; Morgan \$2.7.

Peanuts—Houston \$6.5; Henry \$5.9; Coffee \$3.9; Geneva \$3.3; Barbour \$3.

Soybeans—Baldwin \$5.5; Morgan \$1.7; Marengo \$1.6; Hale \$1.6; Limestone \$1.6. Timber—Washington \$9.5; Monroe \$6; Clarke \$5.5; Covington \$5.3; Marengo \$4.

LAOS INTERVENTION COMPELLING SUPPORT FOR CREATION OF JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN POLICY

(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, I have today introduced a bill to create a Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Policy. I think that no greater object lesson demonstrating the necessity for this committee is offered than that revealed to us in the events of recent days concerning U.S. involvement in Laos.

The U.S. intervention in Laos has proceeded without congressional deliberation or authority. Yet, only today the Washington Post reports, in an article by Warren Unna, that:

Bomber-crew losses have sharply increased in the past 2 months.

The article cited an American embassy report from Laos listing 184 American air crewmen flying over Laos now missing, an increase of almost 30 since last December. And as today's Washington Evening Star reports in an Associated Press article:

So far, the administration has refused to disclose if Americans are serving in Laos, the rate of American air missions in that country or the United States casualty rate.

The increasing activity in Laos violates, at the least, the spirit of the amendment to the fiscal year 1970 Department of Defense Appropriations Act, Public Law 91-171, which the House agreed to on December 18, and which provides:

In line with the expressed intention of the President of the United States, none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to finance the introduction of American ground combat troops into Laos or Thailand.

There have been reports that there are ex-Green Berets operating in Laos under the aegis of the CIA. There are other reports of numerous U.S. "military advisers" in Laos. Furthermore, the B-52 sorties over Laos have become a regular occurrence.

The latest figures, as of February 19, 1970, show that 40,562 Americans have been killed in combat in Vietnam; 267,174 Americans have been wounded in Vietnam; and 7,458 Americans have died there from other causes. How many of these deaths and casualties are actually attributable to U.S. activities in Laos is unknown.

The Vietnam tragedy should be a lesson to this administration not to repeat the miscalculations and mistakes of the past. It should be a signal to Congress that it must exercise a forceful oversight function over foreign policy and not abdicate its necessary and proper role.

So that Congress can more effectively deal with foreign policy questions, I have proposed the creation of the Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Policy. As section 3(a) of my bill provides:

It shall be the purpose of the Joint Committee to insure that the Congressional role in creating and passing upon foreign policy is firmly and clearly effected; to expand the Congressional capacity to deal with foreign policy problems; to provide a clear focus on the difficult decisions to be made by the Congress and the Executive branch affecting foreign policy; and to provide the other committees of the Congress with the necessary background to insure effective action on foreign policy problems and needs.

The committee is empowered to report to the House and to the Senate, by bill or otherwise, its recommendations. The committee is authorized to make continuing studies and investigations of all foreign policy problems including, but not limited to, treaties with foreign governments, foreign economic and military assistance, and military expenditures.

The urgency of trenchant, penetrating, and informed congressional analysis and control of our foreign policy cannot be overemphasized. The statistics of death and destruction in Vietnam are stark testimony to this urgency.

I also commend to my colleagues an editorial published in the New York Times on February 12, 1970, which urges creation of the committee I am today proposing. My proposal implements the recommendations of the Citizens Panel of the United Nations Association headed by former Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESS AND FOREIGN POLICY

Many thoughtful Congressmen in both Houses have been protesting against Presidential prerogatives that, without real consultation, have taken the country into a large-scale war in Vietnam, ill-disclosed commitments elsewhere in Asia and an accelerating nuclear arms race with Russia.

Frustration over Congressional impotence in foreign and defense policy has stirred a neo-isolationist trend. It also produced last year a series of legislative attempts to limit the powers of the executive branch. But the problem is far from resolved.

Presidential predominance stems from the Constitution and from the very nature of foreign policy and defense decisions. These often require secrecy, a need for speed in crises and a clear chain of command for military forces and nuclear weapons. Parliamentary control, by contrast, is difficult to apply. Short of denying appropriations to implement Presidential decisions—a drastic remedy many lawmakers hesitate to use—Congressional influence is not easily asserted.

An overriding need exists for a more effective way to involve Congress in the broad formulation of national objectives and the strategy for achieving them. A series of imaginative proposals in this field has now been put forward by a United Nations Association panel of prominent citizens, headed by former Justice Arthur J. Goldberg. The most important of these would establish a statutory requirement for an annual Presidential "State of the World" message to be considered by a new Joint Congressional Committee. Its personnel would be selected from the Senate and House committees on foreign relations, armed services and appropriations.

The operation of the Joint Congressional Committee on Economic Policy, which reviews the annual Economic Report of the President, is an existing parallel. But the real aim would be to gain for a select number of Senators and Congressmen the prestige, knowledge of secret matters and influence that has been wielded in nuclear policy by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. That committee has not always been more enlightened than the executive branch, but its power has assured effective checks and balances in the governmental process. Similar influence in the hands of a joint committee on foreign and defense matters would fundamentally alter policymaking in these fields.

Working out the relationships between such a new joint committee and the standing committees from which it would be drawn would not be simple. But unless the Congress itself can overcome its own inadequacies and upgrade its mechanisms, its hope of dealing

with the executive branch on a footing of equality on national security policy will be condemned to failure.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DENNEY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), from 1:30 p.m. today, on account of official business as a member of the House Select Committee on Crime.

Mr. STAFFORD (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business as a member of the House Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. SIKES), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. BARING (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HAGAN (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. LENNON (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program, and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, for 45 minutes on Tuesday, March 2, 1970.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FISH) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. FINDLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MINISH, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GERALD R. FORD to extend his remarks in the RECORD immediately following the President's economic message today.

Mr. QUIE to include extraneous matter in his remarks today on the school lunch bill.

Mr. MADDEN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SAYLOR to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter in regard to House Resolution 799.

Mr. FRASER and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FISH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BUSH in four instances.

Mr. CONTE in two instances.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. MESKILL.
 Mr. SCHADEBERG.
 Mr. CLANCY.
 Mr. LUJAN.
 Mr. ZWACH.
 Mr. QUIE.
 Mr. CUNNINGHAM in five instances.
 Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. BURTON of Utah in 10 instances.
 Mr. CONABLE.
 Mrs. DWYER in two instances.
 Mr. PRICE of Texas in two instances.
 Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.
 Mr. FOREMAN.
 Mr. HALPERN.
 Mr. WOLD.
 Mr. GERALD R. FORD.
 Mr. DUNCAN.
 Mr. TALCOTT in two instances.
 Mr. ASHBROOK.
 Mr. BOB WILSON in three instances.
 Mrs. REID of Illinois.
 Mr. REID of New York.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McMILLAN in four instances.
 Mr. MINISH in two instances.
 Mr. DE LA GARZA in three instances.
 Mr. RYAN in five instances.
 Mr. RODINO.
 Mr. MONTGOMERY.
 Mr. MOORHEAD.
 Mr. TUNNEY.
 Mr. KASTENMEIER.
 Mr. DANIEL of Virginia.
 Mr. FRASER in four instances.
 Mr. WOLFF in four instances.
 Mr. GONZALEZ.
 Mr. PRAYER of North Carolina in two instances.
 Mr. GIBBONS in two instances.
 Mr. REES in three instances.
 Mr. LONG of Maryland in four instances.
 Mr. BOLAND in two instances.
 Mr. PODELL.
 Mr. DELANEY in two instances.
 Mr. DORN in two instances.
 Mr. MURPHY of New York.
 Mr. NIX in three instances.
 Mr. STOKES.
 Mr. EDMONDSON in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 2, 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:

1687. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury as Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies, transmitting the Council's special report on the proposed U.S. contribution to the Consolidated Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank (H. Doc. No. 91-261); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

1688. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a compilation of findings and recommendations for improving Government operations relating to

fiscal year 1969 (H. Doc. No. 91-270); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1689. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting the annual report of the Secretary of Defense on Reserve Forces for fiscal year 1969, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 279; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1690. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the need to revise work schedules of employees assigned to railway and highway post offices, Post Office Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1691. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 57th annual report of the Secretary for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1969; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1692. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report relative to pre-financed projects involving waste treatment facilities and listing reimbursable amounts by States and communities; to the Committee on Public Works.

1693. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend for a period of 10 years the existing authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to maintain offices in the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 16185. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.R. 16186. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide financial assistance to States for the construction of correctional institutions and facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 16187. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct certain inequities in the crediting of National Guard technician service in connection with civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 16188. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 16189. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to eliminate, in the case of shrimp vessels, the duty on repairs made to, and repair parts and equipments purchased for, such vessels in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 16190. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to assure the safety, reliability, and effectiveness of medical devices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 16191. 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. HENDERSON:

H.R. 16192. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the making of grants to medical schools and hospitals to assist them in establishing special departments and programs in the field of

family practice, and otherwise to encourage and promote the training of medical and paramedical personnel in the field of family medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 16193. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 15-percent increase in annuities and to change the method of computing interest on investments of the railroad retirement accounts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 16194. A bill to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 with respect to the disposition of the proceeds of sales, bonuses, royalties, and rentals under such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 16195. A bill to amend section 4452 of title 39, United States Code, to extend the third-class bulk mail privilege granted to qualified nonprofit organizations to election materials required to be furnished by governmental authorities to registered voters under State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McMILLAN (for himself, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. DOWDY, Mr. HAGAN, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. KYROS, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. CABELL, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. WINN, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. LANDGREBE, and Mr. SCOTT):

H.R. 16196. A bill to reorganize the courts of the District of Columbia, to revise the procedures for handling juveniles in the District of Columbia, to codify title 23 of the District of Columbia Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 16197. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to eliminate the inclusion of agricultural credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 16198. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit charges for certain services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 16199. A bill to establish a working capital fund for the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 16200. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to extend the authorization for appropriations and provide for the uniform compensation of Assistant Directors; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 16201. A bill to supply the manpower needs of the Armed Forces of the United States through a voluntary system of enlistments, to further improve, upgrade, and strengthen the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 16202. A bill to amend the act of June 27, 1960 (74 Stat. 220), relating to the preservation of historical and archeological data; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 16203. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct certain inequities in the crediting of National Guard technician service in connection with civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WAGGONER:

H.R. 16204. A bill to designate as the John H. Overton lock and dam the lock and dam authorized to be constructed on the Red

River near Alexandria, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 16205. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to exclude from the mails as a special category of nonmailable matter certain material offered for sale to minors, to protect the public from the offensive intrusion into their homes of sexually oriented mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 16206. A bill to restrict travel in violation of area restrictions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16207. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 16208. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 16209. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the making of grants to medical schools and hospitals to assist them in establishing special departments and programs in the field of family practice, and otherwise to encourage and promote the training of medical and paramedical personnel in the field of family medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 16210. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the making of grants to medical schools and hospitals to assist them in establishing special departments and programs in the field of family practice, and otherwise to encourage and promote the training of medical and paramedical personnel in the field of family medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 16211. A bill to amend the Randolph-Sheppard Act for the blind so as to make certain improvements therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 16212. A bill to designate certain lands in the Three Arch Rocks, Oregon Islands, Copalis, Flattery Rocks, and Quillayute Needles National Wildlife Refuges as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 16213. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment

for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 16214. A bill to establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

H.R. 16215. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. HAYS, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. POBELL, Mr. REES, Mr. ST GERMAIN, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 16216. A bill to provide for the elimination of the use of lead in motor vehicle fuel and the installation of adequate anti-pollution devices on motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H.R. 16217. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 15-percent increase in annuities and to change the method of computing interest on investments of the railroad retirement accounts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.J. Res. 1104. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 1105. Joint resolution with respect to peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.J. Res. 1106. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. Con. Res. 517. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the annual reduction of the national debt in order to establish a sound fiscal policy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIE (for himself, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. ZWACH, and Mr. GOLDWATER):

H. Res. 856. Resolution for the appointment of a select committee to study the effects of Federal policies on the quality of

education in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WAGGONER (for himself, Mr. ROUDEBUSH, Mr. ASHBROOK, and Mr. FLOOD):

H. Res. 857. Resolution to reprint House Document 213, 83d Congress, first session, "Permit Communist-Conspirators To Be Teachers?"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DIGGS (for himself, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. REUSS, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. FRASER, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. REES, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. PATTEN, and Mr. WOLFF):

H. Res. 858. Resolution restricting Governor Maddox as a guest in the House of Representatives dining room; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 16218. A bill for the relief of Emanuel Stavarakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 16219. A bill for the relief of Edgar Harold Bradley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

313. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to prescribing more stringent emission standards for motor vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

314. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, relative to admission requirements at Veterans' Administration Hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

315. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of Guam, relative to uniformity of the national standards for welfare assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE BUSING ISSUE

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1970

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an article entitled "Busing Issue Looks Explosive," written by Theotis Robinson, Jr., and published in the Knoxville News-Sentinel of recent date.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSING ISSUE LOOKS EXPLOSIVE

(By Theotis Robinson, Jr.)

The issue of busing students to achieve a racial balance is becoming explosive. In an effort to implement the Supreme Court's 1954 ruling on segregated schools, Federal

courts have been ordering some Southern school districts to employ busing as a means of achieving racial balance.

This has brought a reaction from many parents and public officials alike against busing. The Tennessee State Senate last week passed a bill banning busing and the House is expected to follow suit. The objectors to busing contend that the system of neighborhood schools would be destroyed if students were bused and that busing works a hardship on students. They argue that a student should attend the school in his neighborhood and not one across town.

All of this probably would be acceptable if it were not for the hypocrisy involved. Where were these defenders of "neighborhood schools" when black children were being bused not just across town but from one county to another so they could attend segregated schools? Black students were bused from Anderson County and Sevier County to Austin High School for many years. There probably are families in both Anderson and Sevier Counties in which both parents and their children were bused to Austin High School. And every black stu-

dent in Knox County also attended Austin. Those outside the city were bused in, but students inside the city had to get there the best way they could. It's too bad that the defenders of neighborhood schools did not see fit to protest back then. That they protest now only points up the hypocrisy involved.

BUSING TREATS SYMPTOMS

There is much to be said for and against the busing of students. One strong argument for busing is that this allows the white child and the black child to get to know each other and to learn to understand each other. The main problem in black-white relations is that there has not been enough communication between the races. If our children can learn to respect each other and communicate maybe they can solve many of the problems which we seem unable to solve.

The main drawback to busing, however, is that it is only getting at the symptoms of the more critical and complex problem of housing patterns. If our neighborhoods were not segregated then our schools would not be