

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, May 20, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. John J. Nicola, chaplain of the Cuban Crusade, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, inspire the Members of this Congress with wisdom that they may cope with the problems of the world and work toward a brotherhood of all men.

Inspire them with patriotism that they may lead our country with justice and charity for all citizens.

Inspire them with reverence for family life that they may assist parents and children to fulfill their duties to You and to one another.

Fill our Congressmen with a deep faith in Your providence, a firm hope in Your assistance and a burning love of You. Bless them today and always. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8190. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 8190) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. MONTROYA, Mr. INOUE, Mr. YOUNG, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. CASE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

## TRASH IS CASH

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues some of the work that has been done by the Environmental Action Coalition of New York in recent months.

The coalition was originally organized to conduct Earth Day, 1970; subsequently

it has become involved in difficult areas of environmental education, the power requirements of New York as they affect the environment, and housing reclamation.

On October 1, 1970, Environmental Action Coalition commenced its "trash is cash" recycling program and invited New Yorkers to bring their bottles, tin cans, and newspapers to nine collection centers; the material then goes to recycling industries. "Trash is cash" now has 15 centers and is working with 20 community groups which collectively generate an average of 20 tons of recyclable materials per week.

Environmental Action Coalition is now applying for Federal assistance under the environmental education program so that it can expand "trash is cash" to include some 140 groups, and most important so that it can advise schools and community organizations interested in collection programs on the techniques of materials handling and the development of local educational programs.

The people of New York currently generate approximately 24,000 tons of solid waste a day; this rate is increasing by 4 percent each year. Simple disposal of this material is becoming a serious problem. The solution to this problem seems to be recycling, but this will work only with the public's cooperation. People must be educated on the impact each individual has on the environment, and how one can effectively participate in the solution. This is what "trash is cash" is designed to do.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to insert for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a news story published at the time the "trash is cash" program was unveiled, as well as a story on the prime mover of "trash is cash," Karen Dumont:

[From the New York Daily News, Sept. 25, 1970]

## RECYCLING PROGRAM WILL TURN TRASH TO CASH

(By Fred Loetterle)

The Trash-Is-Cash recycling program was officially unveiled yesterday by the Environmental Action Coalition, which challenged all New Yorkers to join the day-to-day fight for a better environment.

The citywide drive by the coalition, which organized Earth Day, is planned to relieve the Sanitation Department's solid waste burden by returning tons of bottles, tin cans and other reusable materials back to industry.

## NINE CENTERS PLANNED

"We are not going to stop until we have reduced the city's garbage load by 30%," said Robert Gale, mastermind of the coalition campaign. Gale discussed battle plans yesterday at the Metro Glass Co. in Carteret, N.J., which has agreed to pay \$20 a ton for old bottles.

The effort will kick off Oct. 1 with the opening of nine waste reclamation centers—three in Staten Island, two in Manhattan and one each in Bronx, Brooklyn and Queens.

## PRICE RATES VARY

The centers will be staffed by volunteers from about 40 Girl Scout troops.

Housewives and others have already col-

lected more than 16 tons of reusable refuse in preparation for the openings.

Gale said the addresses of the centers will be announced within a week.

The cash-for-trash rates vary from \$200 for a ton of aluminum to \$5 for a ton of bi-metal, the soda can material. "The non-environmental dividends will go to the Girl Scouts and other community groups at first," Gale said. "Later, individuals will be paid cash on the spot for their trash."

"This thing is bound to work," said Richard L. Cheney, executive director of the Glass Container Manufacturers Institute and a backer of the campaign. "We are expecting to get a hell of a lot of glass."

The Metro Glass firm, which is taking a small loss for environment's sake by using old glass collected by community people, gave newsmen and coalition personnel a tour of the recycling process.

M & T Chemicals in Elizabeth, N.J., which has offered to buy old cans from the five boroughs, showed the same group how used metal can be reused.

"The industries have made their commitment," Gale said on the tour. "Now it's up to New Yorkers."

[From the Niagara Falls Gazette, Feb. 17, 1971]

## PRIME MOVER OF "TRASH IS CASH"

NEW YORK.—Karen Dumont, the 26-year-old executive director of Environmental Action Coalition of New York was raised in Indiana and never thought much about pollution until she moved here in 1968.

"I don't know why I reacted more strongly to it than most people," said the soft-spoken red-haired executer of a \$100,000 annual budget and such innovative projects as "Trash Is Cash," a program to recycle solid wastes.

"Actually, I think my concern was pretty average," she said. "I just started out assuming that I could do something, and that I could be effective. I thought I could make a difference."

## OTHERS ARE APATHETIC

By her own estimation, that's the only difference between her and most other people who would like a cleaner environment but fail to act.

A graduate of Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Karen knew little about urban problems and even less about ecology when she moved to New York in 1968 with her husband, a paleontologist with the Museum of Natural History.

In college, she said, "I worried about graduating, not about causes." Her major was English, followed by brief study toward a master's degree in medical literature research.

Karen was working as an administrative assistant for Vassar College last spring when, by chance, she attended an ecology conference at Barnard College here that led to formation of the coalition, a nongovernment group.

## TIME HAD COME

Teaming up with young lawyers and others—"I decided the time had come to stop complaining and do something"—Karen joined the coalition full time to help plan "Earth Day" last April.

"It was just great," she said of the coalition's coming-out. "We announced 'Earth Day' and thousands of people showed up on Fifth Avenue to buy buttons and listen to speeches.

"But it turned out we spent \$12,000 and raised \$2,000," she said. "So, that's the way we started—with no money, a \$10,000 deficit

and a meeting to decide whether we should keep going."

The decision was affirmative and within eight months—in November—Karen was appointed executive director at \$100 a week.

#### PAYING FOR DISCARDS

One of her major projects now is "Trash Is Cash," a coalition program launched last October to pay New Yorkers to turn in reusable bottles, papers and cans for recycling by industry.

At first the coalition planned to sell the materials to industry, then pay donors one-half of the income, Karen said, but donations by individuals proved too costly to process. There have been no payments so far.

"Now we're trying to reorganize the program around collections by community groups," she said. "Otherwise, it won't work."

Other coalition programs deal with environmental education, including work with school children, distribution of pamphlets and operation of Volunteer Speaker's Bureau to train volunteers in ecology and public speaking.

#### MORE REALISTIC

"I think we have become more realistic in our approaches," said Karen, whose modish attire includes steelrimmed glasses.

"I'm no crusader because that's not an effective way to get things done. The main point is to sit down with people, and to work reasonably and calmly to get things done," she said. "I'm interested in making projects at hand work, and in making them work well."

Karen, with a paid staff of six, spends much of her time raising funds for the coalition, which depends on donations from private corporations and foundations for most of its revenues.

"Sometimes, I'd give anything just to get out of the city for a day, to get away from the problems," she said. "But I'm here, and the problems are here. You just have to try."

#### THE PROPOSED CONFERENCE ON THE SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1971

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the other body was stricken from the second supplemental appropriation bill funds for the continuation of the supersonic transport, the SST. In my judgment, this kills the SST program.

It is my expectation that when we meet in conference with the Senate, hopefully early this afternoon, the House will recede and agree with the Senate as to the discontinuation of the development of the SST. There are some funds in the Senate version of the bill for the termination costs. These costs would be a matter for some discussion and decision by the conferees. However, I thought that the House should know that we of the conference committee will not insist on the further efforts to continue the development of the SST. We regard this, or at least, as chairman of the House group, I regard this now as a dead issue.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank the gentleman from Texas for his thoughtfulness in calling me a few minutes ago to tell me that he proposed to address the House to say that respect to the conference on the second supplemental appropriation bill, he would recommend to the conferees that they recede and concur with the Senate in killing the SST program. This, I take it, would take the form of accepting the so-called Proxmire amendment No. 56. The distinguished gentleman from Texas also told me that conference negotiations as far as the SST is concerned would be limited exclusively to discussing the termination costs of the SST program. Is that correct, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. MAHON. I believe the gentleman has made the situation completely clear and with complete accuracy.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I should like to say that I had intended to offer a motion, as the House knows, to instruct the conferees to recede and concur with the Senate in killing the SST but in view of the assurance of the gentleman from Texas to the House I shall not offer that motion now. It seems to me he has agreed to everything my motion sought to achieve.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I, too, want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I recognize, in light of what happened in the other body, that the course of action taken by the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the committee, is probably the wiser course.

On the other hand, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations what the figure is for cancellation costs that the other body has included?

Mr. MAHON. The other body has included the sum of \$155.8 million for cancellation costs. The House in its original version—in the committee—had included \$85 million. These funds are to refund the contractors' cost shares. Whether this will be the end of the cancellation cost we are not able to tell at this time, and the figure which may be agreed upon in this bill is not possible to predict.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I believe that the figure used by the other body of \$155.8 million, in contrast to the \$85.3 million as contained in the House bill as the cost of cancellation, is a much more honest figure as to the ultimate termination cost.

Let me say that if the gentleman from Illinois has done today what he said he was going to do yesterday, I want to be on the record as saying that I would oppose that action for two reasons:

First, I think it is bad policy to instruct House conferees.

But, second, I wanted to have the opportunity to vote "No" in order to clearly indicate that, personally, I want no part of paying any of the termination costs for the SST.

I think we would have been far wiser to have proceeded with the two-prototype program, in light of the expenditures which the U.S. Government has made already of almost \$1 billion. Those Members of the Congress that canceled it have the burden of voting to pay the cancellation cost. I, for one, want no part of that obligation.

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

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

Mr. BOW. The distinguished chairman of the committee has consulted with me on the statement he has just made and I am in agreement with the gentleman.

I regret very much that we are not going to complete the two SST prototypes. I support the prototype development and I think we are making a great mistake in terminating the program. But being a realist, I think we recognize that there is not much else we can do.

I do hope we can arrive at a reasonable cost of the liquidation of this contract in conference.

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

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

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to concur in the remarks that have been made by the distinguished minority leader and by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow), the ranking member on the Appropriations Committee, and with the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations.

I too would have resisted the motion of the gentleman from Illinois, but in light of his statement that he will not try to instruct the conferees, I certainly support the position of the gentleman from Texas.

We have to be realistic as to what happened in the other body. I just hope that the termination costs are realistic and that we will be fair with the parties involved in this, and one of the main factors has been what the airlines have paid in. I hope the conferees in their deliberations will arrive at the decision to pay the termination costs.

#### PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 8190, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 8190, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON)?

There was no objection.

**APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 8190, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1971**

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8190), making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I merely want to state again that in view of the assurances by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) to the House, that the House conferees will accept Senate amendment No. 56 I will not offer my motion to instruct the conferees. It was at this point that the rules of the House require that a motion to instruct conferees be made.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, it would be my opinion that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) is following a very reasonable course in this matter, and I wish to thank the gentleman. I think it would have been my responsibility, had the motion been made by the gentleman from Illinois to instruct the conferees, to oppose the motion vigorously, and to move that the motion be laid upon the table, with the assurances to the House that we would not insist upon a continuance of the SST program because the events of yesterday have made it perfectly clear that the SST is at the present time dead, and cannot reasonably be expected to be revived.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I will respond to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) by saying that I think the House vote which occurred a week ago in reversing its previous decision was based upon wrong or inadequate information, a motion to instruct conferees to be an extreme kind of procedure. I proposed to offer it because of the untenable position in which the House conferees found themselves in having to maintain an obviously absurd position. Absurd because of the statements made by the contractors following the House vote in attempting to revive the program. In view of the assurances of the gentleman from Texas that he considers the SST program dead and that the House conferees will accept that view, I shall not offer my motion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON)?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I just want the RECORD to show that I too was prepared to offer a motion to instruct the conferees and concur with the Senate in regard to the termination of the SST. I certainly support the figure of an \$85

million payment for the termination of the contracts with Boeing and General Electric Co. as reported by our subcommittee, and I support it here today.

But in view of what the chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) has said, there is no need to delay this matter any further, and I believe we should go to conference and wind up our work with regard to the SST.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON)?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to believe that calling quits to the U.S. program for two experimental prototype SST's is a mistake. In the long run, it will prove contrary to the best interests of this country.

But the mistake was not made yesterday by the Senate. The mistake was made last March when both the House and the Senate, by slim majorities, voted to cancel the project without tangible results as it neared completion.

Last week the House of Representatives, considering serious unemployment in the aviation industry, a decline in the dollar's international strength, and continuing SST development by the French, British and Soviets, tried to correct its March mistake.

The House acted on the basis of the best information available and, I believe responsibly. Certainly events have shown this was not any attempt to bail out the Boeing Co. It was an attempt to serve the long-range interests of the United States to retain the worldwide competitive advantage which American-built commercial aircraft have enjoyed since the dawn of aviation, and to conserve the heavy investment the taxpayers already had made in this experimental program.

Subsequently, for reasons not yet fully clear, high officials of the companies concerned have made statements suggesting that they are no longer interested in carrying out the original terms. One must remember that the Congress abruptly repudiated these terms last March. Under such circumstances the Senate has acted understandably, if not wisely. It is unrealistic not to assume the House will concur.

At some date in the future we will have to face this issue again and the cost of resolving it will then be far greater, in my judgment. The United States may now lose its longstanding preeminence in commercial aviation forever because of Congress' mistake last March compounded by the shortsighted refusal of the contractors to make minimal sacrifices and take minor risks today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees:

MESSRS. MAHON, WHITTEN, ANDREWS of Alabama, ROONEY of New York, PASSMAN, BOLAND, NATCHER, FLOOD, STEED, MRS. HANSEN, MESSRS. MCFALL, BOW, JONAS, CEDERBERG, RHODES, MINSHALL, CONTE, and DAVIS of Wisconsin.

**COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE**

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

MAY 19, 1971.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope from the White House, received in the Clerk's Office at 1:45 p.m., on Wednesday, May 19, 1971, said to contain a message from the President transmitting the Annual Report on Radiation Control for Health and Safety.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

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

**ANNUAL REPORT ON RADIATION CONTROL FOR HEALTH AND SAFETY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-113)**

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:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with Section 360D of the Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-602), I am herewith submitting to you the 1970 Annual Report on the administration of this Act transmitted to me by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 19, 1971.

**KEEP HISTORIC FORT SHERIDAN A MILITARY BASE**

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

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I address these remarks today in behalf of the retention of Fort Sheridan, a large military post located in my congressional district which has been in existence for more than 75 years.

The 5th Army headquarters which has been located at this post is being transferred to Fort Sam Houston, Tex., and is supposed to be carried out by June 30, 1971.

However, I want to call attention to the fact that this Army base is particularly well equipped for the service of the Army and there are many other Army activities in the Midwest which can utilize this base effectively.

Under study at the present time by the Secretary of the Army are the transfer of the Army Veterinarian School, the Defense Supply Agency and the 86th Army Reserve Command and other military activities.

It is my hope that these will be transferred to Fort Sheridan and that we can retain this important military base,

which I might say is fully equipped to take care of these needs. With the advent of a volunteer army we need this type of military post to encourage our young men to join and remain in the service. It is my hope and expectation that we can retain it.

I might say that I am speaking in opposition to a position being taken today by the junior Senator from Illinois, Mr. ADLAI STEVENSON III. I regret that he has taken that position and I hope the Secretary of the Army will act to retain Fort Sheridan in accordance with my views.

The studies being made by the office of the Secretary of the Army will be completed by June 30. Meanwhile, it is premature and most inadvisable to recommend the abandonment of Fort Sheridan for an uncertain alternative use.

Under a proposal advanced recently by the President, the beach portion of Fort Sheridan could be used jointly by the public and by the military and civilian personnel stationed at this base. I have requested that this plan should be put into effect at Fort Sheridan in order that the public may enjoy that part of the property along the beach. The balance of the Fort Sheridan property has been developed specifically for military uses—and should be devoted to these uses—as long as a need for them exists.

More than 2,000 military and civilian personnel—exclusive of the Fifth Army—remain at Fort Sheridan. This is far more than a shadow as the Illinois junior Senator has described it. These are life and blood people who are devoting their careers to public service and to our national security.

#### THE UNITED STATES IN SPACE— U.S. VERSUS U.S.S.R.

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

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, in a very few weeks the Congress will be asked to consider the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1972. During this period before the bill comes to the floor, I am using the opportunity to present a series of articles on the United States in space. This material in the composite will provide my colleagues with a total overview of this Nation's civilian space activity and permit them to gain a fuller understanding of this country's commitment to space.

The first five articles of this series which I have submitted have each touched upon a distinct facet of the total NASA program—the manned, applications, and planetary programs—as well as the international achievements and technological benefits of NASA's work. Certainly these aspects of our space activity are the most publicized and the best known. But there is one further, inescapable implication of the NASA program which should be highlighted.

The total space program of our country has two very distinct components—NASA and Department of Defense. Although NASA's effort in space, first and

foremost, is for the peaceful use of all mankind, and this is strongly borne out by the direction of NASA's goals, the question of military applicability must be asked. Does NASA's work, in fact, have military implications? Furthermore, what is the relationship between the NASA and DOD efforts in space? How does this relationship compare to the Russian civilian and defense programs in space? And how similar are the U.S. and U.S.S.R. civilian programs in terms of fitting into the total space program of each nation?

These points are all the more pertinent at this particular point in time. When the first sputnik was fired into space, many of our space experts, and certainly many of our citizens, feared the worst—an orbiting bomb. Somehow the unknown and unanticipated carries with it all the more fearsome implication, but sputnik was explained and our collective nervous system was calmed. Now, however, we see a trace of that same fear returning, provoked by an early attempt of the Soviets to establish a permanent manned orbiting platform. A platform for peaceful scientific experimentation? A platform for strategic reconnaissance? Or, a platform for the storage and delivery of sophisticated weapons? Indeed, an examination of the civilian and military programs of the two nations is all the more in order because of the recent Russian achievements.

Perhaps to better understand the relationship between the two military and civilian space efforts, a short summary of program objectives and program funding is in order. For the most part there would appear to be little difference between the Soviet and United States space programs as to general purpose and direction. Both are broadly based, and both contain the rather distinct elements of scientific exploration, technology development, national security and prestige, practical applications, and military support services.

In terms of funding, the United States by mid-1971 will have spent approximately \$60 billion on its combined civilian and military space programs. Of this total amount, roughly two-thirds will have been directed to NASA for use in pursuing unclassified and non-military programs, although approximately three-fifths of the total U.S. flights will have been conducted by the Department of Defense. This apparent contradiction between NASA having been appropriated more money and yet having flown fewer missions is because the civilian programs of NASA are more expensive due to their ambitious and developmental nature.

The annual expenditure for the total U.S. program in space reached a peak of \$7.7 billion in fiscal year 1966, and has dropped steadily from that peak to a figure of approximately \$4.8 billion in the present fiscal year. Therefore, at the peak this Nation was spending almost 1 percent of its gross national product on space, whereas today the Nation is spending closer to one-half of 1 percent.

There is no way to accurately determine the relative rate of expenditure by the Soviet Union on civilian versus military space programs. The Soviet Union does not publish detailed space budget

data. But certain estimates can be made based upon the accomplishments of the Soviets as well as the number of missions flown. With respect to civilian versus military emphasis, the Russians claim that virtually all of their flights are scientific in nature. Yet, a very considerable number of their flights give undeniable indications of serving military purposes. It is felt, therefore, that the military facet of their space program is more heavily funded and stressed than the military space work being pursued by our Defense Department.

Regarding Soviet space expenditures, it is generally assumed that the Russian spending is at least of the same magnitude as that of the United States at its former peak, and may even be larger. This would put the annual outlay for the total Soviet space program between \$7 and \$8 billion per year. Furthermore, with the gross national product of the U.S.S.R. estimated to be less than one-half that of the United States, this would mean that the Russians spent about 2 percent of their gross national product on space.

In terms of annual spending the NASA outlays are approximately \$3.3 billion per year. The Soviets spent over \$5 billion on their civilian program. In the defense area we spend \$1.5 billion while the Soviets spend over \$2.5 billion. With respect to dollars, the total U.S. space budget of \$4.5 billion represents approximately 60 percent of the \$7.5 billion total Soviet space budget.

But the sharp disparity between the annual outlays for space by the Soviet Union and the United States is only part of the story. What is just as significant is the spending trend which has been developing over the past half decade. What we must recognize is that the NASA budget of today rests at a figure of only one-half of its former peak. In contrast, the budget for the civilian effort of the Soviet Union has been continuously and progressively increasing over the past 15 years. And there are no indications that the Russian space budget is tending toward a tapering off. In fact, there is heavy indication of the contrary.

But the dollars invested as a sole indicator of the goals and directions of the U.S. and U.S.S.R. space programs must be carefully qualified. This is because of the separation in this country between the civilian programs of NASA on the one hand, and the defense related programs of our Department of Defense on the other hand. By comparison with the Soviets, there is only a minimal amount of cross-coupling between the two efforts.

Within the Soviet Union, in contrast, the civilian and military components of the total space program are related to the point of being virtually inseparable. The fact is most vividly demonstrated by a comparison of the launch rates of the United States and Russia. The United States launched 13 "civilian" space missions and 16 "military-oriented" missions in 1970. But the Russians launched only 24 "civilian" missions last year in comparison to a total of 57 Soviet missions which this country regarded as military in nature. At the same time, however,

Russia proclaimed a vast number of successes in its "civil" space program and a sharp increase in its applications and scientific missions. The civilian versus military launch rates of Russia, together with the "civil" accomplishments, would tend to support this theory of heavy cross-coupling.

Returning to the launch rates just mentioned, these figures in themselves give rise to great concern. From 1957 through 1969, this country had continuously launched a greater number of civilian missions on an annual basis than the Soviet Union. In 1970, our civilian launch rate was one-half that of the Russian, 13 versus 24, reflecting both a severe drop in the U.S. rate, as well as a steady increase in the Soviet launch rate. This same trend is even more apparent in military space launches. Our Department of Defense launched 16 military-oriented missions last year as opposed to the U.S.S.R. military launch rate of 57. In fact, since 1967, when the annual Soviet military launch rate first surpassed ours, the Russians have launched more than 200 missions versus 80 for this country. And in these figures there is cause for a certain amount of alarm. During the major portion of the last decade the primary focus of the civilian space activities of the United States and the U.S.S.R. was the lunar program. The race was to place a man on the moon. These efforts as the single dominant programs within both countries received a preponderance of funding. But today this arena for competition is greatly changed. The lunar activity is no longer the sustaining interest of this country and the same would appear to be true with the Soviet Union. It is therefore thought by a number of our leading space experts that the Soviet Union will turn increasingly to military-oriented activity. And unfortunately, many of the recent Soviet flights have tended to reinforce this fear.

As a most prominent example, Russia continues in the operational development of its fractional orbital bombardment system—FOBS—which is designed to deliver a warhead while avoiding existing U.S. radar defenses. Instead of the bombardment system following the shorter route to the United States in coming across the top of the world, the FOBS would approach from the south. This lethal satellite would then discharge its warhead before a full orbit was completed, and thus, circumvent the international restrictions banning weapons from space.

The FOBS system, of course, has certain disadvantages in that it must be able to be called down to a precise target on signal from any number of varying orbits. It is, therefore, more difficult to manage than an intercontinental ballistic missile housed in a standard silo. Furthermore, if radar defenses are appropriately situated, a bomb in orbit can be more readily tracked and therefore destroyed.

But the fractional orbital bombardment system does have the unique advantage of being able to complicate present U.S. defenses. The United States with its radar designed to scan the Arctic

Circle has virtually no guard against the FOBS path of attack.

The obvious defense for this type of system is one in which inspection-destruction satellite vehicles can be on station to intercept hostile satellites. Russia recognizes this also, and, in fact, the Soviets have made significant progress in this particular field too. The U.S.S.R. has actually demonstrated its capability in maneuvering one automated satellite close to another so as to perform an intercept mission. As long ago as 1968, Soviet satellite missions have practiced intercept passes, and in some cases actually intercepted and destroyed the second satellite.

A further effort in which we should anticipate heavy technology transfer from the Soviet civilian space program to the military space program is in the area of the orbiting laboratory. The Salyut I, which was launched last month, is clearly an early prototype of the kind of space station that Russian scientists and engineers will have aloft in 3 to 4 years. Furthermore, the station is said to be carrying most of the systems that the Russians have been developing for permanent use in space. With the one Soviet manned spacecraft having joined it in orbit, the Russians are a full 2 years ahead of the United States in this area of manned space flight. Obviously, this effort by the U.S.S.R. in the development of a manned laboratory has heavy application to both civilian and military-oriented programs. Specifically, Soviet scientists have pointed out that from a space platform it would be possible to make transcontinental missiles accurate to within tens of centimeters. The advantage, of course, in launching a missile from space is that the weapon would be almost impossible to monitor, let alone defend against.

But as the orbiting laboratory represents a substantial advance to both the Soviet military and civilian space programs, so, too, does the present NASA space shuttle program carry strong potential for future military work by the Department of Defense. Based upon extensive examination of the shuttle concept, the U.S. Defense Department is now planning to equip an entire fleet space shuttle vehicles with unique military hardware and operational support systems. As the DOD points out, it will be able to amortize its investment over the first few years of operation, quite possibly even sooner than NASA. The Defense Department is now forecasting the use of the space shuttle to orbit essentially all DOD payloads, thus permitting the phasing out of its expendable booster inventory. Indicative of the firmness of its commitment to the space shuttle, the Air Force has now severely cut all future investment in its existing stable of launch vehicles in anticipation of their being discontinued.

The same advantages of the space shuttle to the civilian community; that is, its reusability, economy, and adaptability, clearly define the shuttle as the space transportation system of the future for the military also. And as would be expected, the Russians are also toying with the concept of a reusable space

shuttle type vehicle. Furthermore, the Soviet aerospace experts on both the military and civilian fronts are strongly convinced of the benefits of such a capability.

As a related topic to this subject of civilian and military space activities, it is also appropriate to discuss the somewhat related topic of space propulsion. It has been observed that in the process of developing future manned and unmanned spacecraft during the next two decades that the United States will develop, virtually automatically, a satisfactory total capability in practically every respect except for propulsion. Regardless of the accuracy of the observation, propulsion is nonetheless important and does become a central issue as we explore our U.S. posture in space and the direction of work required for this Nation to maintain its preeminence in the field.

Twenty years from now, space flights—both manned and unmanned—will take place in an entirely different environment. The public will have become accustomed to high standards and precision in space operations. Just reaching a destination in space will no longer be satisfactory; this Nation will already possess the capability to "merely" reach the desired destination. The demand will be for fast, reliable, and economical transfer of both goods and personnel. This demand goes to the very heart of the matter of propulsion.

The solution is clear. The only propulsion system which will economically provide the required capability for both small and large payloads is a nuclear system—a nuclear system such as that currently being developed by NASA.

It is important to realize that the nuclear transportation system will be designed as an integral part of the total space transportation system of the future. The nuclear propulsion system will be designed to couple with the outbound or deep-space mission to move the cargo from a low earth orbit through completion of its final mission.

As the space shuttle vehicle represents a revolutionary advance in launch and booster technology, the nuclear-propelled rocket system represents an equally significant concept for future deep space transportation. As an example, the nuclear-propelled system now under consideration by NASA would be able to double the payload and mission capabilities of the Saturn V launch vehicle. What this would mean if such a system would have been available for the recent Apollo 14 mission is that our astronauts could have stayed on the moon no less than 30 days as opposed to the 2 days to which they were limited. Or alternatively, if the mission was held to the 2 days, two LEM's could have been landed on the moon, one carrying the astronauts, with the other presumably loaded with equipment and experiments. The nuclear propulsion work being conducted by this country offers the promise to both the civilian and military space programs for a major advance in the efficiency and economy of space transportation.

In summary, it is perhaps academic to attempt to draw a precise line between the military and civilian space efforts of

both the United States and the Soviet Union. Indeed, it is this very cross-coupling admittedly less in the United States which had led to the success enjoyed by both countries. It is a healthy and wise decision which provides for combining the appropriate elements of both programs in the interest of greater accomplishment and greater economy. Thus, the continued work in both the civilian and military space fields is highly essential; no less essential than the continued and expanded cooperation and coordination between the two programs.

Finally, there is the issue of the Soviet challenge. The U.S.S.R. has a long, impressive list of space firsts, including the first man in orbit. Where the accomplishments of the U.S. space program have been greater, it has been by virtue of our resourcefulness, industry, and confidence. But the Soviet program has been expanding steadily for many years and it is now larger than ours in terms of resources committed.

There is also every sign from the Soviet news releases and from their recent space activity that the U.S.S.R. is preparing for major space advances in the near future. Manned flights will continue leading toward an orbiting laboratory; their planetary effort is expected to yield spectacular successes; and the Soviets have recently given added stress to the practical applications of space.

Furthermore, it must also be assumed that the Soviets clearly regard the space program as a value not only in itself, but also as a means of maintaining the image of Soviet leadership and strength in the eyes of the world.

From this preceding discussion of the U.S. civilian and military space efforts, it becomes obvious that the core of the NASA space program is twofold. Primarily, the objectives of NASA's work are to keep America at the forefront of space exploration and development to make space work for us on earth and to provide a steady flow of returns in science, applications, and technology from our national investment in space. NASA's work is to provide America with continuing strength in space as this country strives to maintain its technological and scientific leadership. And as a secondary goal, we must recognize that NASA's effort in the development of technology and the advancement of science is an integral part of our national security. Although this Nation has chosen to divorce its civilian space research and space activities from programs of the Department of Defense, there is an unavoidable element of cross-coupling and applicability. Furthermore, as the world situation and the needs of the Defense Establishment may dictate, the resources and capabilities of NASA can be marshalled to meet the challenge.

It gives me particular pleasure today to announce on behalf of my chairman, the Honorable GEORGE P. MILLER, of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the program for the Joint House/Senate Colloquium on International Environmental Science, to be held May 25-26, 1971.

This colloquium is being jointly sponsored by the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and the Senate Committee on Commerce and will begin at 10 a.m. on Tuesday in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the U.S. Capitol. All Members have been invited to attend this session, which we believe to be unique. The program for the 2-day colloquium is as follows:

PROGRAM OF COLLOQUIUM  
TUESDAY, MAY 25, 1971, 10 A.M.

*Opening remarks*

Representative George P. Miller, Chairman, Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives.

Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Chairman, Committee on Commerce, United States Senate.

Dr. Thomas F. Malone, Vice President, International Council of Scientific Unions, Rapporteur for the Colloquium.

*Introductory remarks*

Mr. Russell E. Train, Chairman, U.S. Council on Environmental Quality.

The Right Honorable Peter Walker, M.B.E., M.P., Secretary of State for the Environment, Great Britain.

Mr. Christian A. Herter, Jr., Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Environmental Affairs.

Dr. Francesco di Castri, Vice President, Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environmental, International Council of Scientific Unions.

(Discussion.)

*Summary remarks*

Dr. Thomas F. Malone.

WEDNESDAY, 26, 1971, 10 A.M.

*Opening remarks*

Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Chairman, Committee on Commerce, United States Senate.

Representative George P. Miller, Chairman, Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives.

*Introductory remarks*

Mr. Kwan Sai Kheong, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Education, Republic of Singapore.

Dr. W. Frank Blair, Chairman, U.S. National Committee, International Biological Program.

Dr. Bengt Lundholm, Secretary, Ecological Research Committee, Swedish Natural Science Research Council.

Dr. B. R. Seshachar, President, Indian National Science Academy.

(Discussion.)

*Summary and closing remarks*

Dr. Thomas F. Malone.

NIX STATEMENT ON LEGISLATION  
PROVIDING SEPARATION PAY FOR  
EMPLOYEES OF RAILROAD TER-  
MINAL COMPANIES

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

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that many employees of

railroad terminal companies, whose duties were those of mailhandlers for these private companies, will now be unemployed.

The reason for this unemployment is the movement of mail distribution facilities from downtown railroad facility areas to facilities out of our cities which will be served by truck transportation. This has been a necessary change. But, as in every sudden change, innocent people are hurt.

The private terminal mailhandlers have, like many others, lost their jobs to alleged progress.

I believe that they should not bear alone the costs of such change, especially since the Federal Government itself is responsible for that change in its postal policies.

For this reason, I am submitting a claim bill which would, if enacted, provide 1 week's pay for each year of service up to and including 10 years, and two weeks' pay at such rate for each year of service over 10 years, plus an amount equal to 2 weeks' pay at such rate for each full year by which the age of such former employee exceeds 40 years at the time of separation.

Thus, my bill is chiefly devoted to providing sizable separation pay for those employees with long years of service who are less likely to obtain new employment.

The terminal mailhandler problem is one that affects us in Philadelphia. It has become a problem in Washington, D.C., and it will become a problem in other cities. I will enter as part of my statement a letter I have received from Mr. James H. Leach, general chairman of the Washington Terminal Board of Adjustment of the Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees.

I hope that there will be favorable action taken with this legislation.

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY, AIRLINE  
AND STEAMSHIP CLERKS, FREIGHT  
HANDLERS, EXPRESS AND STATION  
EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO-CLC,

April 20, 1971.

HON. ROBERT NIX,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. NIX: I am writing to you concerning the handling of United States mail at the Union Station in Washington, D.C. I know you are aware of a similar situation existing in Philadelphia and in Minneapolis.

We have discussed this situation with Thomas Kennedy, your counsel for the subcommittee on Postal Facilities. He suggested we compile this report for your information.

Our members on the Washington Terminal Company property have handled United States mail at Union Station, Washington, D.C. since the Station opened in the year 1907. In recent years the Post Office Department has elected to change the mail handling procedures by removing mail from railway cars and transporting it by trucks either over the road or in railway piggy-back service. As a direct result mail arriving in Washington by truck had to be accommodated and a truck dock facility was placed into operation at the Washington Terminal Company. This truck dock was erected to meet the specifications set by the Post Office Department and the cost of such construction was in the neighborhood of \$200,000. The three-year cost of the facility ran in the neighborhood of \$1,000,000, not including labor. The facility was never used to capacity. On or about June

JOINT HOUSE/SENATE COLLOQUIUM  
ON INTERNATIONAL ENVIRON-  
MENTAL SCIENCE

(Mr. DAVIS 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. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker,

3, 1970, the Post Office Department invited several companies, including the Washington Terminal Company to a meeting at which time it was explained that the Post Office Department would accept proposals for a new mail-handling facility to be constructed in the Washington area. Such proposals were to include the construction of a facility. The proposals were to be made by 3:00 p.m. on June 18, 1970, or a total of 15 days. Inasmuch as the proposal included securing and purchasing land, cost estimates for the construction of a facility, and cost estimates for securing automated equipment, the majority of those companies represented at the June 3 meeting did not even make an offer to the Post Office Department, basically because of the short period of time involved to prepare the proposal and also due to the fact that only an 18-month contract was involved to cover an investment which undoubtedly would exceed \$5,000,000.

The successful bidder was Mail Express, Inc., a subsidiary of the Sealand Trucking Company, which in turn is a subsidiary of McLean Industries—a company which recently merged with the R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. The contract was awarded on June 24, 1970, and the facility was to be in operation on October 15, 1970, if possible, but no later than November 1, 1970. There were approximately 600 of our employees (members) at the Washington Terminal Company involved in the mail handling operation.

Our Brotherhood through its international representatives and legislative department fought the opening of this facility since last June. The facility would have opened on time but for violations of building permits and sewage problems. The opening was delayed until April 14, 1971. Due to the opening of this facility our members have been furloughed with the last furlough taking place effective April 23, 1971 and on this date we will have a membership in the Mail and Baggage Department at Union Station of approximately 76, which means some 524 members have been forced out of their jobs due to the action of the Post Office Department.

In losing their positions these members are also losing accumulated benefits now accruing to them under existing agreements and federal laws such as vacations, holidays, life insurance, health and welfare benefits and retirement annuities. The majority of these employees are at a point in life where other employment is not available. Many will end up on the welfare rolls of the District of Columbia.

The Post Office Department is going to build their own facility in the Washington area in Largo, Maryland, on the Capitol Beltway approximately five miles from the facility built by Mail Express and their own facility should be in operation by March of 1972. Had the Post Office Department left the mail at Union Station until their own facility was built, at least the employees of the Terminal could have then been offered employment with the Post Office and would not have been put into the ranks of the unemployed.

We ask your help in writing a bill which would protect and give employees in cases such as this a severance pay which would enable them to be rewarded for their many years of faithful service and which would require the Government, due to their actions, to make the employees whole for the loss of their jobs.

I might also call to your attention that it is my understanding that the depot in St. Paul, Minnesota, will be closed and locked effective May 1, 1971, due to Railpax taking over the railroads and the officials of the Railpax contend that the employees of the St. Paul Terminal are not protected under the federal law which established Railpax. We have some 200 members being affected at that point. Perhaps a situation such as this could also be included in a bill. If you would

like to discuss this matter with me or the representatives of our legislative department, we would be pleased to meet at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. LEACH,  
General Chairman, Washington Terminal Board of Adjustment No. 164.

#### AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESS TODAY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess today subject to the call of the Chair.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I was unable to hear what the distinguished majority leader said. Would he repeat his request?

Mr. BOGGS. I asked permission that the Speaker may declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair today.

My purpose for doing so is, as the gentleman knows, as I discussed it with him earlier this morning, is the possibility—and I use that word “possibility” advisedly—that the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill may come back this afternoon.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I will yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) if he wishes me to.

#### AUTHORIZING CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My purpose is to ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time after the filing of the conference report on the second supplemental appropriation bill to call up the conference report for consideration.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, that adds to the pertinence of the question I was about to ask. Does this request for a recess mean that we might be in recess until tonight, this evening, or into the night on this thing? Does anyone have any idea about the extent of the proposed recess?

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

Mr. GROSS. I would like to address that question to the majority leader.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman would have to address that question to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. MAHON. It would be my thought that an early decision can probably be reached on the second supplemental appropriation bill and, if an early decision is not reached, then I would not recommend that the House be kept in session indefinitely.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the House would not be in session indefinitely. The House would be in recess. But what I am trying to find out is does a recess contemplate a session tonight?

Mr. MAHON. In my judgment, the House ought to adjourn after a brief re-

cess if it develops that we cannot come to a quick agreement, and at the moment it is not anticipated that we would wait until after 6 o'clock on this matter.

Mr. GROSS. And the gentleman would be kind enough to advise the leadership of the House, I assume, if he saw that a conference agreement could not be reached until evening?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, of course I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I concur with the distinguished gentleman from Texas. It is not the intention of the leadership to keep the House here late this evening.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

#### RAIL STRIKE LEGISLATION MERELY TEMPORARY

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Chairman STAGGERS and the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee should be congratulated on the rapidity and dispatch they exercised in holding hearings and presenting the legislation that restored operation of the American railway transportation.

In the last 15 years the Congress has been called upon seven times to settle disputes between railway management and the railway brotherhoods. It is a remarkable fact that other industries—steel, automobile, retail, and so forth—can sit down and, in the vast majority of cases, collectively bargain and negotiate a settlement of wage disputes and working conditions. Clever financial manipulation on the part of corporate manipulators is the primary cause of the condition of the American railway system today. Through railway mergers and numerous change of control and management, fabulous salaries for company officials, and almost a total disregard of replacing passenger train equipment and passenger service, this great industry has been a victim of inexcusable laxity, neglect, and lack of sincerity on the part of financial operators of the entire American railway system.

The basic reason for this condition is the constant feeling on the part of railway management that the Government will come in and bail out the bankrupt railway operations in order to prevent a collapse of our economy in case of a strike or lack of finances to continue rail transportation service. The deplorable railway passenger service comes about directly by the fact that railway management has neglected equipment replacements and the efficient service which they rendered a quarter of a century ago. If the railroads kept up efficient passen-

ger transportation and service, our public highways would be relieved greatly of the automobile congestion which now exists, especially in metropolitan areas.

I supported the legislation enacted by the House yesterday but did so reluctantly because it does not answer the railway problem permanently. It is, indeed, unsound legislation. Until Congress finds a formula that will avert these last-minute showdowns by setting up machinery which will bring about collective bargaining and settlement of railway labor disputes involving vital transportation facilities, we will soon have a repeat of the same rail tieup we experienced this week. The recent strike was a major threat to our economy, defense, and the Nation's general economic welfare. It should be a lesson to the transportation committees of the House and Senate and urge them to immediately bring out legislation that will give adequate time for both sides to negotiate rail and work problems and in the end provide for a strike-free settlement.

#### THE REPRIMAND OF GENERAL KOSTER

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the reprimand of Maj. Gen. Samuel Koster, by reducing him in rank and stripping him of his Distinguished Service Medal must go down in history as one of the most unusual actions tolerated by our Nation against its commanders during a time of war.

Like most Americans, I know no more of the incident than what has been reported in the papers. However, Secretary Resor's purge of an Army commander who served his country in World War II, the Korean conflict, in Vietnam, as well as Commandant of the U.S. Military Academy, can only be considered as another, in a long series of acts taken to demoralize the American people as well as those in command of our fighting forces.

With such a future, there is little wonder that many of our Nation's career fighting men are leaving the military services and so few can be induced to join a voluntary force.

If it is a whitewash that is deemed necessary to cleanse our guilt to the public opinion makers, I suggest that we should start with Stanley Resor, Secretary of the Army, rather than with our enlisted men, combat field officers, and now a combat commander.

The new casualty list out of Washington will soon begin to exceed the casualty list out of Vietnam.

After all, every country that loses its wars can expect to see its gallant fighting men disgraced, tried, and destroyed.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND THE WEEK OF MAY 24, 1971

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week, if any, and the schedule for next.

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

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

Mr. BOGGS. I appreciate the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader. We have no further program for this week, unless the conferees on the supplemental appropriation bill agree expeditiously. Then we would hope to call up the report for votes.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District day, but there are no bills from the Committee on the District of Columbia to be considered.

On Monday we will consider House Resolution 415, Post Office and Civil Service Committee investigation authority.

On Tuesday, we have scheduled House Resolution 411, disapproval of Reorganization Plan No. 1, which includes the merger of VISTA with the Peace Corps.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week:

House Resolution 155, Select Committee on Energy Resources; and

House Joint Resolution 3, Joint Committee on the Environment.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

As previously announced earlier in the session, we plan to recess at the conclusion of business on Thursday until noon, Tuesday, June 1, for the Memorial Day recess.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished majority leader answer this question: Conferees have been appointed on the second supplemental appropriation bill. I understand they are meeting at 1:30 p.m. today with their counterparts from the other body. If they reach an agreement within a reasonable period of time, we will reconvene after a recess and consider the conference report. If the conferees are deadlocked, then we will adjourn today at the close of business. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. BOGGS. That is correct.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, MAY 24, 1971

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did the gentleman previously announce that there would be, tentatively, a session on Friday of this week, this being the third Friday in the month?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. No, I did not. The an-

nouncement which was made several weeks ago was to the effect that there would be sessions on the first and third Fridays after the Memorial Day recess.

Mr. GROSS. It was to take effect after Memorial Day?

Mr. BOGGS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As the distinguished majority leader knows, we did discuss the unusual situation in the month of July, when there will be five Fridays, and when it is already agreed there will be a no business day on the first Friday because of the 4th of July. Does that mean we are going to plan tentatively for business on the third and fifth Fridays?

Mr. BOGGS. The Speaker and I have discussed that matter. It is our conclusion that that would be a satisfactory solution as far as the month of July is concerned.

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

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

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### AUTHORITY FOR CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DULY PASSED, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I have a further unanimous-consent request to make, considering the situation if the conferees do not agree early this afternoon.

I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate, and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

#### OVERTIME PAY FOR CAPITOL POLICE FORCE

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

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that it has been our policy that no employees of the legislative branch receive overtime pay for extra hours of work performed. This has applied across the board from the employees of the Architect's offices to the Members themselves.

In my opinion, we have experienced an exceptional emergency in the past month and it is time to recognize the fact that overtime pay is due a section of our legislative employees; namely, the Capitol Police force.

Since early April, these men have been carrying an extremely heavy load of overtime and with no break in sight, they will not even be permitted to take advantage of the compensatory time to which they would normally be entitled for this period.

In at least one case with which I am familiar, a Capitol policeman had to forfeit a part-time job and much needed extra income to carry his share of the overtime load as a Capitol policeman.

These men have done a terrific job during the last month and should be rewarded, not penalized, for their efforts.

I am pleased that the Senate acted to place funds in the second supplemental appropriation bill to pay for the overtime hours these men have put in during this recent period of disturbances, and I urge the House conferees to accept this provision to provide proper compensation to the Capitol Police for their recent outstanding service.

#### NEGOTIATIONS TO PROVIDE LIMITATIONS ON OFFENSIVE AND DEFENSIVE WEAPONS

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, today may be recorded as one of the great days in the history of the world. The United States and the Soviet Union have agreed to simultaneously negotiate limitations on both offensive and defensive weapons. The negotiations have been at the highest levels of both governments.

If we succeed in the negotiations which will follow from this point we may even have within this year, some agreement on deployment of the antiballistic missiles.

Here is another indication that this administration is working day after day in the interest of the United States and in the interest of world peace so that we can concentrate on those things that all of us in the world desire most.

#### DOES THE HOUSE REALLY WANT TO WORK ITS WILL?

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most common things we hear are those persons who say "Let the House work its will; let the Congress work its will." Last Monday and Tuesday, we had the manpower training bill up, the House did, indeed, work its will and shut down the work of the Committee on Education

and Labor which was in the process of coming up with a more reasonable solution. The leadership apparently does not want the House to work its will. They took the bill off the calendar, and it is not on the calendar this week, next week, or for 2 or 3 weeks. Do they really want the House to work its will?

#### A PRAYER FOR OUR PRISONERS OF WAR

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, in the clamor raised by those who wish to end the war at any cost, and in the press of our daily national problems, one fact has been obscured.

Seven years and 55 days from this date, the first American prisoner of war was taken in Southeast Asia. Since that time, thousands have joined him. These brave men have not decried the system, nor attempted to overthrow the establishment; they have instead suffered the horrors of detention by the enemy in serving their country and defending the rights of those who have been protesting so loudly. I think it only appropriate that each of us offer a prayer today in their behalf.

#### CUBAN INDEPENDENCE DAY—1971

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 69th anniversary of Cuba's independence. On May 20, 1902, the flag of the sovereign Republic of Cuba was unfurled in Havana for the first time. That thrilling moment was the culmination of a long and tireless struggle by the Cuban people for freedom and independence.

It was the beginning of a new era—an era in which, despite moments of despair and disappointment, the average Cuban citizen increasingly participated in a new spirit of hope and liberty. It was an era in which Cuba's economy grew and the nation prospered. But all this is ended. For the magnificent revolution of Maximo Gomez, Antonio Maceo, and Jose Marti has been ruthlessly betrayed by a petty tyrant.

Yet today is a day for celebration, for the spirit of Cuba's heroes is alive in the minds and hearts of hundreds of thousands of Cuban refugees here in the United States, and throughout Latin America, and of millions more still in Cuba. And it is fitting that we mark today's celebration here in the Congress of the United States for we in this country can be proud of the part we played in the victorious struggle for Cuban independence, however small it was in comparison to that of the Cuban people themselves.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Florida yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Florida for the very fine statement he is making.

No man has been more aware of the cruel dictatorship that presently exists in Cuba than has the gentleman from Florida. No man has done more to assist the hundreds of thousands of Cuban refugees who have left their native land because of the denial of freedom. Most of these fine people have gone to the gentleman's State or to the gentleman's district.

Mr. Speaker, I think the whole country can be proud of the generosity of the State of Florida, the people of Florida, and more particularly the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL), for extending to these refugees the hand of friendship and generosity and the opportunity for employment.

I know that what these people really want is to return to Cuba as free Cubans in a free country with a freely elected government.

Mr. Speaker, I also commend the gentleman for what he has done over the years to bring about the accomplishment of that goal.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader for those comments.

The gentleman from Louisiana has long been in the Nation's forefront with his interest and knowledge of Latin America. Not only because he reflects the concern of the district the gentleman represents, but because he reflects concern for a problem that vitally affects the national interest.

I also thank the gentleman very much for his comments with reference to the efforts of the people of Florida and the people of this Nation who have so graciously received the Cuban refugees. Yet, I say, notwithstanding the excellent motivation of the Cubans themselves, the help which has been extended by the local communities, by many groups, and the States themselves, it would have been impossible for the States of this Nation, particularly Florida, Louisiana, New Jersey, and others, to have received this tremendous influx of refugees from the tyranny of Cuba had it not been for the Federal programs in reimbursing States and local communities for their contributions in education, health, and employment.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Cuban refugee assistance program has been and continues to be a humanitarian cooperative effort at every level of government.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Florida yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as my distinguished friend knows, I was raised in St. Augustine, Fla. I am no "damn Yankee." I am just a plain Yankee.

I wear in my lapel this morning, because I knew the gentleman was going to speak of old Cuba Cespedas the Distinguished Service Cross which this Con-

gress by law authorized from Cuba in the old days.

As the gentleman knows, I have been there many, many times.

I am so pleased that my friend, the gentleman from Florida, is doing what he is doing. And as the distinguished gentleman, the majority leader, said, if I can help, as they say—and you know the gesture—which comes from my heart.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania. I can assure the gentleman that the whole world knows how the gentleman has helped, and that he indeed speaks from a full heart. The gentleman is not only entitled to the award of recognition which he received from the non-Communist Government of Cuba, but he is entitled to an award of recognition from our whole country.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman means the former government, not the present regime in Cuba.

Mr. FASCELL. Of course I mean the former government. I realize that, and I am sure the record is quite clear.

The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) has long been a leader in the struggle to improve and to maintain the kind of relationships between North and South America that we are striving for; to help all areas of Latin America which are coming into the 20th century, and to protect their security and freedom. His record in this respect is distinguished, it is long, it is loud, it is clear, it is well recognized, admired and loved. I also thank the gentleman for his remarks concerning our need to commemorate the independence struggle of a great people, the Cuban people.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN).

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Florida on the statement he is making, and also to join with him in paying tribute to the people of Cuba as distinguished from the present government of that country.

I believe that one significant element should be emphasized here in relation to the discussion that has taken place on the tremendous migration of Cuban people which has occurred and on the emigrants, who, because of necessity, came to the United States, and particularly to the district which the gentleman from Florida represents, and that is the contributions that they on their part have made to the United States. They have not depended upon charity nor drowned in self-pity, and they are people who have been assimilated, and who have joined into the fabric of our national being, and who have made a very great and constructive contribution to life in this country.

Mr. Speaker, might I also say that I should like to commend the gentleman from Florida not only for the statement he is making today, but also for the leadership that the gentleman has given in the House of Representatives through his chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the Committee

on Foreign Affairs. By this activity the gentleman is calling attention every day to the need for this Nation, and particularly this administration, to devote full and complete attention to the problems that are arising south of the border. I can think of no greater contribution that any Member of this Congress could make to the national welfare than to do this very important job. And I wish to express my gratitude to the gentleman from Florida for his devotion in carrying out this important duty.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) who serves so ably on the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs for his comments. The gentleman has served very capably on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I am grateful for his membership on our subcommittee, where I depend a great deal upon his knowledge and his interest in Latin America.

The gentleman and I have a common cause, because even though the gentleman comes from Connecticut, and I come from Florida, we both recognize—as so many do in the Congress—that the fate of the United States and the fate of the people of South America are inextricably entwined politically, economically and socially, and that we can only at our peril ignore what happens in Central or in South America. As the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) said, we really are one, and we need to keep speaking this message constantly.

The Western Hemisphere today remains a bulwark in the free world, and it must remain that way. It can only remain that way if we insist constantly on supporting the dynamism of democratic institution, human dignity, the right of self-determination. We must constantly point out the fact that is not the situation that exists in the present government in Cuba today, because that government is a subversion; it is a tragedy. It does not represent the kind of independence and freedom that the Cuban people fought for in their fight for self-determination, because in every essential it is purely a political dictatorship.

Our concern for the freedom of our Cuban neighbors goes back more than a century. It is a concern which continues today. The American people can never rest easy while our friends and neighbors remain enslaved by a man whose ideology is alien to the democratic and humanistic traditions of our hemisphere. We can—we must—continue to do everything possible in cooperation with freedom-loving Cubans to again make the Cuban Government a government of, by, and for the people.

#### THE SOVIET THREAT

Today's government in Cuba is anything but a government by and for the people. Increasingly it is a government by and for its Soviet masters who prop up the Castro regime with everything from guns to flowers in order to use Cuba for their own ends. One of those ends, the establishment of Soviet naval power on the very borders of our country, is of tremendous consequence to the United States.

We all remember the Cuban missile crisis—those somber days when a dramatic—perhaps desperate—Soviet move to upset the strategic balance of power brought us to the verge of nuclear war. Well, today we are again witnessing a more subtle and perhaps just as serious an attempt to change the balance of power in our own backyard.

Since 1969, the Soviet Union has systematically gone about establishing the bases in Cuba for a continuing naval presence in the Caribbean Sea. Whether that presence will take the form of conventional or nuclear vessels remains to be seen. But in and of itself, it is a dangerous development—dangerous because of its implications right in the Caribbean area and indirectly because it may require the withdrawal of scant U.S. naval forces from other important areas such as the Middle East.

Of even greater potential danger is the possibility that the extensive naval facilities under construction at Cienfuegos on the south coast of Cuba can and might be used for the servicing of nuclear attack submarines or even worse, nuclear missile submarines. Establishment of a missile submarine base in Cuba greatly augments the station-keeping ability of Soviet subs and might very well have a serious adverse effect on the U.S. strategic nuclear posture.

Reportedly, the Soviet Union and the United States have some understanding on what kind of naval activity will be permitted on Cuba. As chairman of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee, I have repeatedly asked just what understanding, if any, there is. To date, beyond an obscure and somewhat curiously worded reference in the Soviet press, I have seen no evidence that there is in fact any such understanding. I doubt that any real understanding exists.

Clearly, the United States must have a definitive policy on a matter so essential to our security, and the American people and the Congress are entitled to know what that policy is. As a first step toward clarifying our policy, I have written to the President asking that he declassify hearings held last Fall by the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee. I think that the text of this letter will be of great interest and I request that it be printed at this point:

MAY 10, 1971.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On December 23, 1970, I wrote asking that you declassify information submitted to our Subcommittee on September 30th and November 24th, 1970, relating to Soviet Naval activities on Cuba. To date, I have not received a decision from you on this matter.

Nearly nine months have passed since the first reports of accelerated Soviet naval construction activity in Cienfuegos Bay, on the south coast of Cuba. Those reports reinforced our earlier impressions regarding Soviet determination to establish a continuing naval presence in the Caribbean. More recent developments, including repeated visits of Soviet naval vessels to that area, have not alleviated our concern.

I feel that this situation is becoming increasingly serious, for two major reasons:

First, because on the basis of my longtime observation of Soviet activities in this Hem-

isphere, I am convinced that the Soviets have attained vastly improved nuclear submarine capacity in the vicinity of our southern shores. The availability of facilities for servicing such submarines would be an important element in such a conclusion; and

*Second*, because I find it exceedingly difficult to accept our Government's assertion that there exists "an understanding" between the United States and the Soviet Union—an understanding which binds the Soviet Union *not* to establish any strategically significant naval facility on Cuba. It seems to me that our Government officials are whistling in the dark when they point to a brief passage in a Soviet newspaper as proving the existence of such an understanding. If that brief quotation is all that supports their case, then it seems to me that they are indulging in most dangerous self-deception.

The lack of reliable information about Soviet naval activities on Cuba has served to increase the American people's concern about our national security and the effectiveness of our foreign policy toward Latin America. I believe that the time has come to begin clarifying these issues. And, I feel that the release of information submitted by the Executive Branch to my Subcommittee on September 30th and November 24th, 1970—while not definitive in itself—would constitute an important first step in that direction.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I would again urge you to act promptly and favorably on the request which I submitted to you last December 23rd.

Respectfully yours,

DANTE B. FASCELL,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs.

#### THE THREAT FROM CUBA

Besides serving as a springboard for Soviet military, espionage, and political activities, Cuba has also been transformed by Castro into a massive base for his own campaign of subversion and terrorism throughout the hemisphere. Each year hundreds of persons from all over Latin America are brought to Cuba and trained in the ugly methods of terrorism. They return to their lands not just with training, but with all the paraphernalia of the "modern" guerrilla training manuals, propaganda films, guns, explosives, and presumably a book called something like "Quotations From Chairman Fidel."

In some corners, it has become fashionable to discount stories of Castro's subversive activities. "It's hard to prove," say some. Or, "It's only a little subversion," say others. Well, let us listen to the man incriminate himself only last month:

We have supported, are supporting, and will continue to support revolutionary movements throughout Latin America.

That is what Castro said 1 month ago today.

#### CONDITIONS IN CUBA

In some ways, if you want to learn about torture—about how to terrorize people—you cannot blame someone who goes to Cuba for a lesson in "how to do it." Castro has a dozen years of experience in betrayal, in stifling a brave people's initiative, in stamping out any vestige of liberty, in murder. Not since the dark days of the 1895 revolt when the Spanish herded thousands of men, women, and children into concentration camps, where in Havana Province alone 50,000 died of maltreatment, has Cuba known such suffering and such cruelty.

Castro's secret police and their spies are seemingly everywhere.

Yet, despite the terror, the propaganda, the constant haranguing, the endless rallies, Castro is failing. Cuba's economy, crumbling for years under his inept leadership, would collapse without the massive Soviet support—more than \$1 million per day—which it receives.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I wish to commend and congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) for taking this special order today to call to the attention of the American people and the free world what is going on in Cuba. The gentleman has been a strong voice in this Congress for freedom for Cuba. The people of this country owe him an eternal debt of gratitude for his deep understanding of what is happening there. I am particularly impressed by his statement that there are those in this country and the free world who cannot see the enormity of the danger that continues in Cuba so long as Castro and his Communists are in control.

The gentleman is correct when he says that there are those who dismiss this thing lightly and say, "Well, it is just a little bit of communism," when the fact of the matter is that Cuba today is the headquarters for exporting terrorism and subversion to the entire North and South American Continents.

In 1962 the Communists at a meeting in Havana, Cuba, adopted the Havana Manifesto. They organized in Cuba the Tricontinental Congress. There were present 600 top Communist leaders from 83 countries in Asia, Africa, and the Americas. These Communist leaders pledged that if the terroristic and subversive techniques which were being tested in Vietnam worked if this so-called war of liberation, as the Communists try to call the conflict in South Vietnam, works, and if these terror tactics that have been developed out there through the years of guerrilla warfare and subversion work in Vietnam, this Havana Congress agreed that they would use those same tactics and techniques in the 83 countries of Asia, Africa, and South America for similar "wars of liberation."

So, Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague in the well, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) makes an enormous contribution on this Cuban Independence Day by calling attention to the fact that this is more than merely a little exercise in Communist doctrine in Cuba. The Tricontinental Congress has its headquarters in Cuba. The gentleman is correct in calling attention to the fact that thousands of young people who go to Cuba every year, ostensibly and allegedly to harvest sugar cane, are in fact attending 43 schools that have now been established in Cuba to train in the art of terrorism and subversion and transport it to countries all over the world.

The schools are operating there now. The gentleman has performed a magnificent public service in detailing the operation of these schools, the methods, the techniques, the tools, the practices that they use in those schools.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we in this House owe an enormous debt of gratitude to the gentleman for taking this time to call the attention of the House and the American people to the extent of the menace and danger that exists in Cuba today.

I saw on the wire today a story about a statement by the President that we are about to reach some agreement with the Soviet Union for control of missile development.

I wish the President would address himself to the problem that lies 90 miles off the shores of Florida, where the real threat to America lies, where the Soviet fleet is moving in and setting up a base in the Caribbean for a Soviet port, where missiles continue to be imported to that island, where Soviet military experts are helping train Cuban experts in missileery.

I believe Americans have been paying much too little attention to what has happened in Cuba. We have taken it for granted and written it off as a Communist satellite, when the fact of the matter is the clear and distinct danger to America lies right in Cuba today.

I congratulate the gentleman for the contribution he makes here today, and I am proud we have men like him serving in the Congress.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his generous comments.

Ever since the gentleman from Illinois came to the Congress of the United States he has been a persistent and knowledgeable voice in pointing out the worldwide scope and meaning of Soviet activities that take place in the Western Hemisphere. They are a danger. I agree we need to be aware of them. We need to face them realistically and clearly.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Florida (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to compliment the gentleman, my good friend and close colleague from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) for obtaining special orders on this the 69th anniversary of Cuban independence from Spanish rule.

It is ironic that we should be commemorating independence day for a country that lost its independence over 12 years ago when it became another satellite of the world Communist movement. Unfortunately, the State Department does not pay what I consider proper attention to this situation just 90 miles off the coast of Florida. In past years it has too often been the policy of the administration and the Congress to pay more attention to the affairs of the world to the east and west of us, and to a great extent neglect our neighbors to the south. As a result of this neglect, we have seen numerous Latin American governments rise and fall, and when the balance is figured, we are the ultimate losers.

We have maintained an Army of over 300,000 men in a small far eastern country 12,000 miles away under the guise of protecting democracy, yet this same democratic process we prize so highly is disappearing just a few miles from our own borders in some instances. If we candidly examine the political situation in Latin

America, much of the unrest and foment can be traced to the Communist regime which now holds the freedom-loving people of Cuba in bondage.

This too is somewhat ironic because the regime of Fidel Castro has been unsuccessful in many of its attempts at subversion. The election of a Marxist president in Chile was not a result of subversion but instead a product of the inherent weaknesses of most Latin American political and economic systems. If we, as a nation, had paid more attention to the problems of our neighbors to the south, we might have prevented these violent swings in governments which were organized and executed by a minority.

Cuba itself certainly is not a jewel in the Communist crown. Since turning from democracy to communism, the island slave state which is governed from Moscow has steadily tumbled downhill.

The economy took a sudden dive when Castro took over and ended the free enterprise system. The State took all and left little to the individual. According to the proclamations of Castro, his new government was to build a new economy. He further promised that Cuba would be the showcase of communism.

Both of these forecasts have come true, but with an ironic twist. The economy is now one of welfare, tied to and completely dependant on the pursestrings of Moscow. The beggar nation takes Russian handouts of \$1.5 million a day. Over the past decade of Communist rule, Russia has poured more than \$5 billion into propping up their paper puppet. Castro's second promise to make Cuba a showcase of communism has also come true. The Communist system in Cuba has shown the dramatic difference between the free-enterprise pre-Castro system and the present Communist dictatorship. Pre-Castro Cuba boasted of the highest standards of living in Latin America, now there are food lines and rationing. Democratic governments around the world could not ask for a better example of the differences between these two systems of government.

The intolerable part of this experiment is that the people of Cuba are the losers. They are the victims of the personal aspirations of Cuba's bearded dictator. The price of freedom has often included an empty stomach, this price can be borne and it has been borne here and in nearly every democratic nation. But to weaken the body and then enslave the spirit is an intolerable situation.

Aside from the economic hardships which the Cuban people have been subjected to, aside from the total lack of political freedom via elections and a democratic process, we have seen freedom of expression under attack in Cuba. In a pattern which has become only too familiar in the Communist world, last week Castro moved to silence a voice out of tune with his official propaganda line. In an attempt to officially stifle dissent he imprisoned a Cuban poet named Heriberto Padilla for verse that tells the true state of the Cuban people under this dictatorship. I would like to quote from his poem, "Out of the Game," where he suggests the proper conduct of a citizen in Communist Cuba:

To walk, as every member does:  
One step forward, and  
Two or three backwards:  
But always applauding.

The people of Cuba have long stopped applauding.

As I conclude my remarks on this Cuban Independence Day, I call attention to another group of courageous people. I speak of the many thousands of Cuban Americans, many of whom risked their lives to escape the Communist tyranny in Cuba to settle in America. Certainly this is a very difficult independence day for them. I salute these proud people for the courage they have shown in building a new life in a new country, and for the contributions they have made to their adopted land.

I am hopeful that this administration and the State Department will give more attention to the problems of this hemisphere in the future, so that Cuban Independence Day might have a real meaning once more for the more than 8 million Cuban people.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman from Florida, my colleague, for his statement. As the whole country knows, he has been a leader in this Congress in raising his voice with respect to the problem the Castro government has presented to the American people.

In 1970, Castro set a goal of a 10-million-ton sugar harvest which would provide the country with badly needed export earnings. While Cuba set a new record, 8.5 million tons, Castro fell miserably short of his goal—so short he even admitted it was a disastrous failure. And it was disastrous—for the effort severely dislocated the entire Cuban economy and set the stage for what is expected to be a much smaller sugar crop this year—and this will drive Cuba still deeper into debt to the Soviet Union.

That the people of Cuba are fed up is increasingly clear. Absenteeism has become a major economic problem. People simply do not want to work more and more for less and less. To combat this, Castro has enacted a forced labor law. More difficult for him to deal with is a rising tide of sabotage by workers.

#### RELATIONS WITH CUBA

Having said all of this about Castro's Cuba, it should be clear that I think it would be a mistake for the United States at this time, and under existing conditions, to consider establishing relations with Cuba. In view of recent events in Chinese-United States relations, many people have called for a reassessment of our relations with Cuba. I do not question their good will and a reassessment can never hurt, but to my mind, there is absolutely nothing analogous in the two situations.

The first requirement for even considering a different relationship with Castro is that he wants a change. Last month, Castro clearly showed that he wanted no such change when he replied to a comment of President Nixon's that the United States would change its policy toward Castro if he changed his toward us.

Castro said:  
Such a gesture, Mr. Nixon, will never be made.

But even if Castro were to make some gesture of reconciliation, I do not believe the United States should consider changing its policy until at least the following assurances are evident:

First. Cuba cease to serve as an advance military and naval base for the Soviet Union.

Second. Cuba renounce its policies and halt its activities aimed at subversion of other nations.

Third. The just right of the Cuban people to self-determination is restored.

Fourth. All American citizens in Cuba and their close relatives are allowed to leave Cuba expeditiously and without harassment.

Fifth. Basic human rights and the rights of due process as provided for by the Organization of American States are to be restored.

Sixth. Political prisoners are released from prison.

Seventh. Cuba will enter negotiations with the United States on legitimate claims of U.S. residents whose properties have been seized by Cuba and for which they have not been paid as customary under international law.

Mr. Speaker, I have dwelt on the sorrowful condition inside Cuba, but I have only taken this time and gone into this detail because of what I consider the great significance of the story of Cuba for our hemisphere. It is a great tragedy which has befallen Cuba, but it will be an even greater tragedy if we do not learn from the experience.

While I am not overly optimistic in the short run, I hope and pray that one May 20 very soon, we will be able to celebrate Cuban Independence Day, not with mixed emotions, but with all the enthusiasm and joy that is in the Cuban character, and that reflects liberty and freedom.

He is quite right in pointing out the difficulties economically in Cuba.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, DANTE FASCELL, is performing a distinct public service in calling our attention to Cuban Independence Day.

Over its long and tortured history, the Cuban nation has suffered under a variety of tyrannies. Under the Spanish governors of yore, Cubans were denied citizenship, slavery was retained until 1886, and those who resisted were executed.

A first, abortive bid for freedom was led by Carlos Manuel de Céspedes but finally suppressed by Spain 10 years later. Then, in 1895, the great patriot, Jose Marti, took charge of an armed uprising that within 2 years had brought half the island under Cuban control. In retaliation, the Spanish governor resorted to open terrorism. After Spain had rejected a U.S. offer to mediate, and the battleship *Maine* was sunk in Havana harbor, the United States formally declared war on Spain on April 25, 1898. Following her defeat, Spain renounced all claims to Cuba in the Treaty of Paris, signed at the end of 1898.

Sixty-nine years ago today, on May 20, 1902, the United States withdrew the last of its forces and Thomas Estrada Palma was inaugurated as the first constitu-

tionally elected president of the newly sovereign Republic of Cuba.

For half a century, Cubans knew the exhilarating air of freedom.

But it was not to last—in 1952, Fulgencio Batista seized control of the government and imposed a dictatorship, and 7 years later was replaced by a different kind of despot—Fidel Castro.

The cruelties of the Castro regime are well known. Some half million Cubans have fled into exile in this country, and perhaps 100,000 of these reside in the district of Congressman FASCELL.

The once bright lights of Havana are dimmed, but the spirit of the Cuban people, their hope for a rebirth of freedom, cannot be quelled. It is this undying yearning that the tyrants who have walked the stage of Cuban history will never be able to overcome, or subvert, and which in the end will destroy them and their evil institutions.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, in pausing today to honor this 69th anniversary of Cuban independence, I find myself thinking back to that day in May 1902 when the first constitutionally elected President of Cuba, Tomas Estrada Palma, assumed his office as head of state and, amidst exultant celebration, the flag of a newly sovereign Cuban republic flew high over the island nation. I think of the Cuban people who were there to witness that deeply emotional event—the culmination of many years of heroic struggle and patriotic sacrifice. I reflect upon how they must have felt—many of them having been born in the shadow of four centuries of colonial rule, having engaged in two major wars and countless insurrections throughout most of a century to assert their right to self-determination, and then, when the strife was over, having labored once more, to create a nation out of the devastation and ruin wrought by years of war and want.

I think I know how they must have felt, as they began a new era in their history in which every man was guaranteed by law the right to liberty, dignity, and the realization of his just aspirations. This was the hard-won reward for their strength and their courage, and their unflinching dedication to a cause which they knew was right. On this occasion, the words of our own Declaration of Independence come back to me: That "all men are created equal," that they are "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," that among these are "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." For the concepts expressed in those noble words, Cuban patriots, like our own, fought and died.

On this anniversary of Cuban independence, 69 years later, my heart goes out to the Cuban people today, for whom those words are merely memories. How tragic that the ideals of the Cuban Revolution have been betrayed. What a monumental crime has been committed against them in the name of Cuban independence, by a Communist tyrant who seeks only his own ends.

Although I know that on this anniversary of their independence, we all share the sorrow of the Cuban people once more in bondage, I believe that we can also share with them the hope of freedom. The fighting spirit so dedicated

to the cause of national liberty which sustained their forefathers through all the years of their struggle for independence will enable the Cuban people to triumph again. Fidel Castro will not succeed. His attempt at dictatorship over the minds and hearts of his people is doomed to defeat.

On this 69th anniversary of Cuban independence, we in the United States join with free men throughout the world in expressing our faith in the people of Cuba, that they will break the bonds of totalitarianism which today imprison them, and will once again establish within their nation a government dedicated to liberty, social justice, and individual dignity.

I have said and I will continue to support as a Member of the Congress the proposition that the U.S. Government should not wash its hands of the agony of the Cuban people but should develop a plan of action to overthrow this tyrant. Ours is a Government dedicated to the cause of liberty in the Western Hemisphere and throughout the world. We have a special obligation to a sister people in their darkest hour. We cannot be content to say: "Free yourself of tyranny." We must, with all the ingenuity and resources available to us, give leadership and support to the Cuban liberation effort.

This is our duty and I think we must not seek to avoid it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 20 of each year citizens of the United States join in the observance of Cuban Independence Day and pay tribute to a once free Cuba. It is always a great privilege for me to participate in this observance and to express my profound hope that the people of Cuba will once again enjoy the freedom which they obtained at the dawn of this century.

In our annual observance of this significant event we are always greatly saddened by the realization that it cannot be appropriately celebrated by those to whom it means the most. Unlike the joyous occasion of our Nation's independence celebration on the Fourth of July, Cuban Independence Day can only be a proud memory recalled by citizens of that country with tears in their eyes.

It is certainly one of the greatest tragedies of history that a people who fought so heroically and sacrificed so much for their freedom from one country's rule have now had it so brutally suppressed by a dictatorial Communist rule which is infinitely more tyrannical and ruthless.

On May 20, 1902, the flag of an independent Cuba was raised over that nation for the first time and Tomás Estrada Palma became the first President of the newly sovereign Cuban Republic. This precious independence came to the island nation only after three-quarters of a century of heroic sacrifice and often bloody struggle against Spanish rule.

Cuba had been a colony of Spain since the first permanent Spanish settlements were established there in 1515. During that period the Cuban people were subjected to a great deal of economic exploitation and were ruled with a tight reign by a highly centralized government composed of appointed provincial officials.

The participation of native Cubans in their government was minimal, as were their other rights and freedoms.

The fervent desire for independence swept through Cuba in the 19th century and their struggle for independence was marked by two bloody wars and countless insurrections. It was during this struggle that the deep ties of friendship between our own Nation and the people of Cuba were forged—fostered in large part by the great Cuban national hero, José Martí. Known as the Apostle of Cuban Independence, Martí fled from his native country after the 10 Years' War and for the next 14 years made New York both his home and the headquarters for the revolutionary movement. During this period Martí worked diligently to unite Cuban exiles and to gain support among American citizens.

The United States was the only country to help Cuba gain her freedom from Spain. During the Spanish-American War in 1898 the island of Cuba was captured from Spain by the American military, and the 1898 Treaty of Paris placed Cuba in the trust of the United States. The provisional government set about to rebuild the war-torn country and with the aid of the United States in many different fields, the Cubans were able to form their own government in 1902.

After the Republic was declared, the people of the United States maintained strong bonds of friendship with their Cuban neighbors and the two Governments enjoyed both friendly relations and mutually beneficial trade.

In 1959, however, the era of Cuban independence was brought to an end as Fidel Castro took control of the government. The tragic results of his rule are known only too well. As Castro's revolutionary government gained in strength, the hideous violation of human rights and liberties of the Cuban people grew accordingly and the Communist machine in that country has increasingly threatened the entire Western Hemisphere.

The United States has welcomed to its shores all those who have been able to flee the Cuba which is now held in bondage. Since Fidel Castro seized control in 1959, more than 410,000 Cubans have emigrated to our country. Most of them have arrived on the daily flights that began in December 1965.

This Communist regime has succeeded in destroying the freedom, prosperity and happiness of the Cuban people, but it has not destroyed their will to regain their freedom. Nor has it destroyed the friendship for the Cuban people in the United States. We share their fervent hope for the return of a free and independent Cuban nation.

#### TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation.

Of the 11 longest railway tunnels in the world, the United States has three.

### A HARD LOOK AT OUR ENVIRONMENT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly evident that we—to paraphrase Mark Twain—talk a lot about the environment but we do not seem to know what to do about it.

It is refreshing and stimulating to find someone who knows both how to talk about the environment and has some basic suggestions on how to do something about it.

In the short period of time since his appointment, Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton has demonstrated a real and practical grasp of the many environmental problems we face.

A clear indication of his grasp of these paramount issues can be found in the remarks he prepared for the Great Issues Forum of the University of Southern California last April 22.

Our former colleague very clearly indicates two basic truths about environmental action. It will require much sacrifice on the part of all concerned and it cannot be dictated from Washington but must come from citizens across the land. Secretary Morton's remarks follow:

#### EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR ROGERS C. B. MORTON

In today's modern dialogue and rhetoric, the words we often hear are "environment" and "ecology." We hear discussion of the "environmental impact" of various activities. We hear the word "ecology" used in many different ways, and I think both of these words have many different meanings in the minds of different people.

Let's ask ourselves "what is the environment?"

In short, it is everything—everything that was here before man—plus all the changes man has wrought, both directly and indirectly. In addition, and not to be overlooked, it must include man himself.

We hear speeches about the "enhancement of the environment," about our desire to make it better. And again, we might ask ourselves "what are man's goals for the environment?"

I think it's fair to say that each individual has his own attitude and his own concept of environmental quality. But basically and constructively, we are searching for change, for action that terminates the destruction of values of this earth necessary to support our life systems and our cultural aspirations.

Specifically, we are searching for a way to eliminate the destructive side effects of man's activities. For example:

1. The elimination of pollution of water and air from the consumption of energy and chemical reaction;
2. The elimination of the aesthetically offensive, such as litter, junk and noise.

We are searching, but perhaps less vigorously, for the elimination of waste, for a way to stretch the supply of our finite resources on which our economic and life systems depend.

We feel that there should be a larger guaranteed share for nature in the scheme of things on the planet's crust. We express this in a desire for more protected wilderness, for more forests, for more rivers, for more open spaces, for more habitat for wildlife and marine life.

But Americans are also looking for ease and comfort—for more automobiles, airplanes, air conditioners, central heat and

central power, daily newspapers, paper plates and plastic spoons. We are looking for more suburban peace, for security in the home and on the street.

Our goals for a healthier environment then, are cluttered with the hopes and aspirations, the fears and the very struggle for existence of every one of us. We are caught between our personal needs and desires and the necessity of a healthy environment. Our world will not survive unless we start to sacrifice some of our personal desires.

The need today is for a realistic national commitment for a healthier environment—a national commitment not merely outlined by our federal government, but a national commitment fostered through the concern of millions of Americans.

President Nixon outlined our national goals last year in his special message to Congress on the Environment. In that speech he said, " \* \* \* no longer is it enough to conserve what we have, we must also restore what we have lost. We have to go beyond conservation to embrace restoration."

Our challenge then is not only to conserve, but to restore, not only to rebuild or rehabilitate, but to replace.

To build a national commitment, however, it is not enough to have a directive from Washington. The great movements of this country have been built in the hearts and minds of millions of Americans. And, this has to be the greatest movement of all—it's a matter of survival for all of us and for future generations.

What I'm saying to you is this: It's not enough for us to make pronouncements and pass laws and penalize polluters while we throw beer cans out the car window, while we drop our own sewage into the rivers, while we leave our camp grounds filled with litter, or while we burn our leaves and our trash in our own backyards.

What we need is a national individual effort—an effort that will go hand-in-hand with government creation and enforcement of necessary anti-pollution measures.

This is the 2nd Earth Day and the concern for our environment has grown from a few voices not many years ago to thousands of citizens. But, this has only been a beginning and during the next year we must double or triple this growing army of concerned citizens. As young people, you are part of that effort and should be congratulated for your past leadership and involvement. Your challenge, however, is to do twice as much this year and double your efforts to recruit more young people into our cause.

Your generation has given us new insight into what it means to be human, to work together, to love one another. Now let's harness all that love, all that energy and strength and enthusiasm to something bigger than ourselves—to a national commitment to a cleaner and healthier environment.

I am convinced that in the decade of the 70's, together, we can make great progress toward cleaner air and cleaner water. Standards have been and are being set. Though the cost will be substantial, we have to be willing to bear it. Much of this investment will show up in the price of power, goods and services.

I believe the public demand for clean air and water is now of such proportions that we will be willing to pay for it as long as we know that we are getting results.

The very nature of water and air pollution control demands heavy involvement by both state and federal levels of government. Obviously there will have to be vast regulatory programs. But no matter how much the government responsibility, there must be strong motivation on the part of citizens and industry. Without this, there is no way to achieve even reasonable goals.

And, the time is now. The next 10 years are critical. I am optimistic about what we

can do to clean up our air and water but, only if we all work together.

We can also make great strides in improving nature's share of the total environment. I am thinking specifically of wildlife and marine life habitat—the establishment of wilderness areas, of set-asides for more park areas, of increasing our forests, and of keeping our rivers flowing free and wild.

In all of these areas, certainly some technology is involved. But the main thing is legislation and dollars. Mostly, it is a matter of acquiring land or setting aside land already in public hands for a specific purpose. It is public acceptance of land use planning, which will guarantee a bigger share of the national surface for nature in the raw.

Long-range plans and disciplinary guidelines are very important, particularly where large watersheds are to be partially reserved or preserved.

We have an example in the Everglades National Park in Florida. Here was established a beautiful park consisting of 1,325,910 acres. Much of its wildlife and fauna, however, are at the mercy of the upstream portions of the watershed which drain into the park, and which are not in public hands. The values of the park are now threatened, because there was no plan to control or manage the watershed upstream of the park.

Now we are in the process of solving this problem. But rest assured it would have been far less costly to have acted with foresight a few years ago.

President Nixon has taken a firm position for funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, at an annual rate of \$300 million. This fund supplies a large share of the money for both state and federal land acquisition. I am convinced that the time is right for an even greater allocation of our resources, and during the next decade, I am confident that there will be a constantly increased allocation of funds for these purposes.

Programs which are designed to conserve and preserve natural areas must have their origins in government. But again, without high level citizen support we are not likely to achieve anywhere near the goals that we ought to set for ourselves.

I am optimistic about the progress we will make in the next decade—in preserving our natural areas.

There are some other things that I feel are essential for us to accomplish as a civilization for which I do not share this same degree of optimism.

I don't believe as a people we have a burning desire to protect the aesthetic values of our environment. Short term economic desire has constantly overridden our patience and willingness to take the time and pay the price for beauty in the countryside and high standards of aesthetic values in design and construction.

I have observed this trend in the construction of government buildings, in the construction and design of homes, in the construction and design of libraries and university buildings, or our highways, airports, transmission lines, and all the rest. As a nation we are not beauty-conscious.

If we are to accomplish real substantive beneficial environmental impact in the area of aesthetics, I don't believe we should look primarily to government for leadership. For help, yes. But not for the genesis of those programs that will have major impact.

Here we must look to the cultural leadership of our society—to civic groups, to universities, and to the professions.

Ugliness should be a challenge to us all. Beauty is a reward worth arduous struggle.

For me, another area of deep concern is in the elimination of waste. Re-use and recycling of many materials can have a multiple and long term beneficial effect, and can greatly extend the life in our finite resources.

Most of our past effort has been limited by

our unwillingness to pay the price or meet the cost of re-cycling. It is not economical and therefore we defer the development of the technology and management systems required until that future day when there will be no alternative.

I am unwilling to accept this concept. As a nation, we are burying ourselves in our own junk and at the same time using up our natural resources at an alarming rate. It is for this reason that the Department of the Interior has initiated intensive study on the elimination of waste and the re-cycling of materials. And, we are by far not the only ones engaged in this effort. However, I believe too little has been done and we have to look at this problem with much more national concern and commitment.

The big natural resource management problem that faces our civilization in my time and your time is the matter of energy. Today we are on an escalating spiral in the use of energy. This use is going up daily on a per capita basis and, of course, is going up tremendously on a national basis.

The sources of the energy we are presently using are limited. We are leaning heavily on the convenience fuels, such as oil and gas. We no longer can consider ourselves self-sufficient as far as oil is concerned.

This means that we have to look closely at our uses for energy and at our sources for fuels. In the offing is the breeder reactor, which may be a great boon to the very last years of this century and early in the next. We must look toward the technology for the use of solar energy. We must look toward an easier way to extract and a more convenient way to use the vast resources of coal with which we are blessed.

Here I believe we have to depend on government for leadership, for initiative, and for control. This does not mean that the private sector will not be the innovators of the new technology, for they will. This does not mean that industry in any way will be dealt out of the energy field, but it does mean that government has a responsibility to work with industry and with the scientist and with the planner to assure successive generations adequate energy. It means our government must develop a national energy policy which will take into account our future needs not just our day-to-day needs.

There already is a bold proposal which can be a great step toward focusing in our solutions to the problems of our environment. The President has laid before the Congress a plan to reorganize the government, consolidating seven of our present departments into four.

One of these will be the Department of Natural Resources, which will bring together the now many-structured components of government which are now dealing with the sophisticated and complicated problems of natural resources and energy requirements.

The new Department of Natural Resources will have a scientific competence for the terrestrial and marine science in such a way that we can project forward through this century and into the next plans and programs for the mineral and energy developments required, as well as for the conservation and extension of life of our finite resources.

This plan of reorganization has its roots in studies that were made in 1937 by the Brownlow Commission, updated again by the Hoover Commission, and now in recent times re-evaluated and re-studied by the Ash Council under the direction of the President.

I don't believe there is anything more important for us at hand than the accomplishment of this reorganization if we are to restore our environment from the damage we have done through the years of excited development in this nation; if we are to preserve the natural beauty and character of our countryside, guaranteeing a true compatibility for man and the rest of nature; if we

are, in short, to provide a priority for the environment equal to the other elements in our civilization, such as the economy and our national security, we must take a bold step and organize ourselves to do the job.

There was a day when men took their hammer and saw and helped their neighbors build the school. Today we all better take our talents and our time to rebuild and rehabilitate our environment.

Your generation—the most educated, talented, and gifted generation this nation has ever seen—can lead the way. You have the most to offer and the most to gain. Together we must commit ourselves to change. It will take your entire lifetime and billions of dollars, but it will be worth every minute and every dollar. For all of us, our national commitment as we lead our daily lives, must be to make every day—Earth Day.

#### AUTHORIZING OVERTIME PAY FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week I introduced legislation in the House of Representatives which will authorize full payment for all overtime incurred by the District of Columbia policemen in April and May of this year as a result of the May Day demonstrations in our city.

The District of Columbia law currently prohibits any policeman from earning more in any 2-week pay period than the base pay of an assistant chief. Many of the policemen, working 14- to 16-hour shifts during the recent disturbances, earned their limited amount and were required to contribute numerous hours of duty.

My bill would retroactively compensate these men for any overtime pay they were required to forfeit under the law for duty performed since April 1, 1971, and would authorize full compensation for overtime during future periods of civil disturbance or natural disaster.

It is my opinion that during this period the Metropolitan Police Department did an outstanding job under the most trying circumstances. All of us in this city and in this country owe these police officers, who have worked long and hard into the night, a tremendous vote of thanks. Their endurance and stamina were tested every day during this period of demonstrations and it would be grossly unfair not to provide them just payment for their superhuman efforts.

If we expect the Metropolitan Police Department to safeguard the people who live and work in Washington, D.C., during mass demonstrations, we should assure these men of adequate compensation for their efforts.

I am extremely hopeful that the District of Columbia Committee will act with dispatch on this measure.

#### THE TOCKS ISLAND DAM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Appropriations Subcommit-

tees on Public Works of both the House and Senate today are hearing testimony on fiscal 1972 appropriations for the Tocks Island Dam on the Delaware River.

The Tocks Island Dam and the surrounding Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area make up a 72,000-acre Federal project to provide water supply, flood protection, power generation and recreation in the Delaware River Basin area. The project directly affects congressional districts in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York.

For several months, Congressmen JOSEPH McDADE of Pennsylvania; JOHN G. DOW, of New Jersey; FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., of New Jersey; and I have been engaged in an extensive effort to gather factual information about the Tocks Island project from all of the various Government agencies which have some responsibility for its development or interest in its ultimate success.

The purposes of this information gathering effort were to provide the news media and the general public with the best available information about the many aspects of this large and complex project.

Because the project has evoked some controversy, and because many of our colleagues are receiving inquiries about the project, I include this 11-part series of information reports on Tocks Island Dam in the RECORD, along with those tables which are suitable for printing in the RECORD:

#### INFORMATION REPORTS ON THE TOCKS ISLAND DAM (APRIL-MAY, 1971)

##### KEY TO AGENCY RESPONSES

- Corps: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
- Int: U.S. Department of the Interior, including National Park Service, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, etc.
- OMB: Office of Management and Budget.
- FPC: Federal Power Commission.
- DRBC: Delaware River Basin Commission.
- TIRAC: Tocks Island Regional Advisory Council (Representing Local Government interests in the Tocks project.)
- Add: Supplemental information developed by the sponsoring Congressional offices, including discussion during two Inter-Agency Conferences on Tocks Island March 1, 1971 and April 6, 1971.

##### PART 1—GEOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

"Design of a dam for the (subsurface) conditions that exist in the vicinity of Tocks Island is well within the capability of present technology," the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has advised four Congressmen representing the Tri-State site of the Tocks Island Dam and Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area.

The Corps' appraisal of subsurface conditions influencing selection of the dam site and its reaction to questions about the project area's susceptibility to earthquakes are contained in this first of a series of Information Reports on the Tocks Island Dam issued jointly by Congressmen John G. Dow of N.Y., Joseph McDade and Fred B. Rooney, both of Pa., and Frank Thompson Jr. of N.J.

This, and each succeeding report, consists of a series of questions submitted by the Congressmen for response by the various government agencies which have a responsibility in the planning, development or operation of the projects.

In addition to reviewing actual site selection procedures followed in locating the Tocks dam site, the Corps reported that it has taken special precautions to design a

dam "that is safe for an earthquake condition that is extremely remote."

The four Congressmen supplemented the Corps' responses to the questions dealing with earthquake potential of the region with a listing of actual tremors recorded in Eastern Pennsylvania and New Jersey since the 1800s and a summary of the Mercalli Scale or measuring earthquake intensity.

1. Precisely where will the dam be constructed, and what tests have been made to select this site, and what are the results of those tests?

Corps: The dam will be constructed with the centerline 100 feet downstream of the lower end of Tocks Island. Investigations made in selecting this site included field reconnaissance and topographic study, geophysical surveys, extensive borings and laboratory tests of soil samples.

A 3,000-foot reach between Tocks Island and Labar Island was selected for detailed study. Extensive drilling and testing was concentrated in this area to determine the precise location where foundation conditions were best. At the selected location, the silt and clay portion of the foundation is more favorably situated than at any other location within the reach. On this basis, the site was selected as most favorable for the dam.

2. Concerns have been expressed that the entire vicinity of Tocks Island has subsurface conditions which are not appropriate for construction of a dam. What conditions do exist, and how do they compare with the sites of other existing dams of substantial size?

Corps: Design of a dam for the conditions that exist in the vicinity of Tocks Island is well within the capability of present technology. The bedrock surface across the valley reaches a depth in excess of 200 feet below the present ground. The deepest part of the valley is filled with sand and gravel materials derived from melting glaciers. Intermixed with these materials are varying thicknesses of silt, clay, and rock flour, resulting from deposition into glacial lakes, ponds, and pools. These finer grained glacial deposits range in thickness from a few feet to as much as 150 feet. The strength of these finer grained materials is lower than the strength of sand and gravel material and cannot be as accurately determined. One of the specific factors in selection of the exact site of the dam was where the accumulation of the finer grained deposits was minimum in order to reduce the influence of these finer grained materials on the design.

Tocks Island Dam, in comparison with other dams, is of moderate height, being 160 feet from streambed to top of dam. Foundation conditions at Tocks Island are not unique, in general, though all damsites are unique in detail. Several dams have been built on deep silt and clay foundations. Terzaghi Dam in British Columbia, Canada, was built on a foundation where the geological origin is similar to that at Tocks Island. Terzaghi Dam is a 200-foot high earth and rock-fill dam which was completed in 1960.

3. Do subsurface conditions pose any hazard whatever regarding construction of this dam?

Corps: No, not when all factors are properly considered in the design. The design includes full evaluation of specific subsurface conditions at the site and includes removal and replacement of portions of the foundation material to assure a completely safe structure. The design has been guided, reviewed, and approved by an expert Board of Consultants consisting of Dr. Arthur Casagrande, who has worldwide eminence in the field of earth and rock-fill dam engineering; Mr. Francis Slichter, worldwide consultant in dam design supported by many years experience in the field; and Dr. Shaller Philbrick, Geologist, Cornell University, who

has many years experience in geological engineering for dam design and who has specific experience with the type of foundation conditions present at this site.

4. Still other concerns have been expressed regarding the potential for earthquake damage to an earth-fill dam of this kind and size. Although the Delaware Valley is not commonly identified by the average citizen as being earthquake prone, the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey of the Department of Commerce indicates that a moderate number of significant earthquakes have occurred in this region in this century. What hazards do earthquakes pose for this dam in this location? How do these hazards compare with earthquake frequencies and dam integrity during earthquakes in other areas where similar dams exist?

Corps: The location of Tocks Island Dam is in Seismic Damage Zone 1, as shown on the seismic risk map recently developed by Environmental Science Service Administration and Coast and Geodetic Survey. This map is used as a guide for the determination of earthquake loading in the structural design of hydraulic structures. The scale goes from Zone 0 (no damage) to Zone 3 (major damage). The map is a revised edition of an earlier one, which was included in the Uniform Building Code, International Conference of Building Officials, 1961. Zone 1 is described as "minor damage; distant earthquake may cause damage to structures with fundamental periods greater than 1.0 seconds; corresponds to intensities V and VI of the Modified Mercalli intensity scale of 1931." The assignment of Zone 1 to the Tocks Island area is based on records of comparatively recent earthquake shocks occurring throughout North America. The incidence of earthquake generated hazards, such as embankment damage, subsidence, landslides in the structural and reservoir areas (with possible generation of destructive waves in the lake), and loss of reservoir water into subterranean fissures is considered to be minimal based on past history of a real seismic activity and probability of occurrence during the life of the project. However, the design of the dam is based on much more severe earthquake effects than would normally be used for a structure in Zone 1. Since the behavior of the silt and clay foundation to earthquake loadings could not be determined with complete assurance, severe assumptions were made regarding the soil behavior and the dam designed to provide safety for these conditions.

In the areas of higher seismic risk (Zones 2 and 3) Corps of Engineers minimum criteria for steel and concrete structures is to design to withstand minimum earthquake accelerations of 0.10g. Earth and rockfill dam criteria is to withstand accelerations of 0.10g and 0.15g in Zones 2 and 3 respectively. Terzaghi Dam is probably in Zone 2 (available risk maps do not go outside U.S.). The design condition for Terzaghi is unknown.

5. Have any earthquake hazards been called to the Corps' attention by other governmental agencies or private groups or individuals with regard to this project? If so, what were those sources and their estimates of the hazards?

Corps: The emphasis on design for the earthquake condition resulted from an evaluation by design personnel that the normal approach was not sufficiently conservative for the site conditions. Thus the design provides a structure that is safe for an earthquake condition that is extremely remote. No earthquake hazards have been called to the Corps' attention by public or private parties except the effect of reservoir loading by Lamont-Doherty Laboratories, Columbia University. This was in the interest of pure scientific and engineering research.

Add: In the interest of securing all available information regarding the frequency of

earthquakes in the Delaware Basin, additional information was solicited from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce. The response cited two publications, *Earthquake History of the U.S.*, and *Seismic Risk Studies in the U.S.* A map (p. vi) in the former locates several earthquake epicenters in the vicinity of the Delaware River. A listing of specific shocks in Eastern Pennsylvania and New Jersey is attached as Page 8 of this report. Several of these are identified by intensity on the Mercalli Scale which is described on Page 9 of this report. The most severe shock recorded in the Delaware River region was one of intensity VII on the Mercalli scale, that at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., according to these publications.

6. In making its selection of the dam site, and in considering the region's potential for earthquake damage, what sources of information, advice or expertise did the Corps utilize and what was the nature of the information, advice, or expertise?

Corps: Comments on earthquake potential were solicited from State Geologists of Pennsylvania and New Jersey and they, in turn, advised of the following publications and references:

- Memoirs of Boston Society of Natural History, Vol. 2, 1871-1878.
- American Journal of Science and Arts.
- Monthly Weather Review of the U.S. Weather Bureau.
- Quarterly Seismological Report of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.
- Annual Publication U.S. Earthquakes, 1926-56, U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey.
- List of Earthquakes felt in Pennsylvania, Vol. 12, No. 11, Publication, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Internal Affairs.

7. In the event of some emergency when the reservoir is filled to its anticipated normal high level, how quickly could drawdown to one-half level, for example, be accomplished? I am thinking now in terms of a fault as did occur in the City of Bethlehem's Penn Forest Dam, also an earth-fill dam, a decade ago.

Corps: With the reservoir at normal pool elevation of 410, the pool could be lowered to the spillway crest elevation of 392 in less than one day. The pool could be lowered from 392 to 352, which is about one-half full in terms of depth of water at the damsite, in an additional three days. The above drawdown rates assume a river inflow of 10,000 cubic feet per second, and release, of water to a maximum capability without concern for downstream flooding.

The difficulty at Penn Forest Dam was not due to a fault but rather to improperly treated vertical joints in the sandstone foundation. There is no similarity between that condition and the foundation conditions at Tocks Island.

*Recorded earthquakes—Eastern Pennsylvania and New Jersey*

(Coast and Geodetic Survey.) (Roman Numerals indicate intensity on Mercalli Scale.)

1800—Mar. 17 and Nov. 29: Severe shocks at Philadelphia.

1840—Nov. 11 and 14: Severe at Philadelphia, great and unusual swell on Delaware River.

1877—Sept. 10: Delaware Valley. Felt from Trenton to Philadelphia, over 20 mile area with center near Burlington, N.J.

1879—Mar. 25: Delaware River below Phila., felt from Chester, Pa., to Salem, N.J., 30 miles. Strongest east of river.

1884—May 31: Strong shock at Allentown, Pa., dishes broken. (V.)

1889—Mar. 8: Pa., felt at Harrisburg, Reading, York, Phila., other points. 10-second duration.

1895—Sept. 1: Felt Virginia to Maine,

centered in Hunterdon Co., N.J., near High Bridge where buildings rocked, articles fell from shelves. Not reported in Pa. west of Easton. (VI.)

1908—May 31: Extremely local shock at Allentown, Pa., toppled chimneys, accompanied by sound like an explosion or fall of heavy object. Possibly caused by rock fall in subterranean limestone cavern. (VI.)

1921—Jan. 26: Moorestown and Riverton, N.J., rumbling. (V.)

1933—Jan. 24: Sharply felt shock at Trenton, N.J.

1938—Aug. 22: Central N.J., western corner of Monmouth Co. Also felt S.E. Pa. Four smaller shocks on 23rd & 1 on 27th.

1954—Feb. 21: Local shock caused extensive damage (hundreds of homes) in 5-block area of Wilkes-Barre, streets and sidewalks cracked, gas & water mains broken. Damage estimated at \$1 million. (VII.)

1954—Feb. 23: Local shock at Wilkes-Barre, similar effects. (VI.)

1957—Mar. 23: W. central N.J. Numerous reports of slight damage in Lebanon-Hamden-Long Island Valley communities. (VI.)

1961—Sept. 14: Lehigh Valley, Pa., buildings shook, objects rattled at Bethlehem, Allentown, Coplay, Catasauqua and Hellertown. (V.)

1961—Sept. 27: Pa.-N.J. border, Bristol, Philadelphia, Bordentown, Trenton.

1969—Four-month period. 42 earthquakes recorded at Ogdensburg, N.J.

Earthquake Intensity as Registered on Modified Mercalli Intensity (Damage) Scale of 1931 (Abridged):

I. Not felt except by a very few under especially favorable circumstances. (I Rossi-Forel Scale.)

II. Felt only by a few persons at rest, especially on upper floors of buildings. Delicately suspended objects may swing. (I to II Rossi-Forel Scale.)

III. Felt quite noticeably indoors, especially on upper floors of buildings, but many people do not recognize it as an earthquake. Standing motorcars may rock slightly. Vibration like passing of truck. Duration estimated. (III Rossi-Forel Scale.)

IV. During the day felt indoors by many, outdoors by few. At night some awakened. Dishes, windows, doors disturbed; walls make creaking sound. Sensation like heavy truck striking building. Standing motorcars rock noticeably. (IV to V Rossi-Forel Scale.)

V. Felt by nearly everyone, many awakened. Some dishes, windows, etc., broken; a few instances of cracked plaster; unstable objects overturned. Disturbance of trees, poles, and other tall objects sometimes noticed. Pendulum clocks may stop. (V to VI Rossi-Forel Scale.)

VI. Felt by all, many frightened and run outdoors. Some heavy furniture moved; a few instances of fallen plaster or damaged chimneys. Damage slight. (VI to VII Rossi-Forel Scale.)

VII. Everybody runs outdoors. Damage negligible in buildings of good design and construction; slight to moderate in well-built ordinary structures; considerable in poorly built or badly designed structures; some chimneys broken. Noticed by persons driving motorcars. (VII Rossi-Forel Scale.)

VIII. Damage slight in specially designed structures; considerable in ordinary substantial buildings with partial collapse; great in poorly built structures. Panel walls thrown out of frame structures. Fall of chimneys, factory stacks, columns, monuments, walls. Heavy furniture overturned. Sand and mud ejected in small amounts. . . . (VIII to IX Rossi-Forel Scale.)

IX. Damage considerable in specially designed structures; well-designed frame structures thrown out of plumb, great in substantial buildings, with partial collapse. Buildings shifted off foundations. . . . (IX Rossi-Forel Scale.)

X, XI. Damage increasing in each category to total in XII.

#### PART 2—HISTORICAL FEATURES

Plans to relocate and preserve thirty-one historically significant structures which otherwise would be inundated by the Tocks Island Reservoir have been reported to the four Congressmen representing the Tri-state site of the Tocks Island Dam and Delaware River Gap National Recreation Area.

The National Park Service cited plans to relocate the structures to at least six sites including a restored village, an early farm complex, a community grouping and an interpretive motor trail.

Both the Park Service, through responses provided by the Department of the Interior, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers discussed their efforts to identify and protect historical features in the project area in this second in a series of Information Reports on Tocks Island Dam issued jointly by Congressman John G. Dow of N.Y., Joseph McDade and Fred B. Rooney of Pa., and Frank Thompson, Jr., of N.J.

Each of the Information Reports consists of a series of questions submitted to responsible government agencies by the Congressmen coupled with the answers supplied by those agencies.

In addition to identifying a number of historically significant structures, today's report includes information about excavation in search of Indian burial grounds and plans for the relocation of several thousand graves to cemeteries outside the project area.

1. What significant historical structures, sites, facilities or other features lie within the project area? And what is their significance?

Int: A careful study of historical structures and cultural remains in the project area was made by Historical Architect Norman Souder, working with the park staff. All structures within the authorized boundaries were surveyed, with almost 200 receiving special consideration. Few of the structures make claim to national significance, but a number played important local roles in our early wars and sheltered famous personalities. Most are of importance, however, because they exemplify evolution of architectural styles from the 17th century, identify patterns of settlement, are associated with early mills and manufacturers, define trends in local commerce and trade, and trace development of the resort industry that is still of such great importance to the region.

Corps: The historical features lying within the reservoir and park areas of Tocks Island include private dwellings of architectural significance; the Van Campen Inn of National significance since a revolutionary general stayed there; the Old Copper Mine dating back to pre-revolutionary days worked by the early Dutch settlers; Old Mine Road over which the copper ore was hauled to the processing plant in New York; several old cemeteries with some graves dating back to late 1700 and early 1800; the grave of General Rosecrans; site of Indian villages and some burials as evidenced during archaeological excavations to date.

FPC: The Federal Power Commission has not received an application to license the pumped storage aspect of the overall project; consequently, its impact on historic features is not known. FPC Order 384 requires the applicant to submit with his application a description of historical and archeological properties listed in the National Register. FPC Order 414 issued on November 27, 1970, entitled "Protection and Enhancement of Natural, Historic, and Scenic Values in Design, Location, Construction, and Operation of Project Works," promulgates policies which would apply to any potential licensee of a pumped storage facility.

2. What significant historical structures, sites, facilities or other features will be permanently lost as the result of development of the dam and reservoir and other features of the public works and parks projects?

Int: The majority of important historical structures are not threatened by flooding or other park developments and may be retained in place, but a number are located on lands to be inundated or on lands subject to periodic flooding. These include structures such as the Isaac Van Campen Inn and barn, braham Van Campen house, Van Campen farmhouse, Ennis house, Westbrook-Bell house, St. Johns Episcopal Church, Zion Church, Bushkill Mill and other structures of lesser importance. Of these others, the Hull house and dependencies, Westbrook-Bell house and Ennis house are scheduled to be protected in place through diking. Some will be preserved through relocation to higher ground. In instances where superior examples exist outside the flood zone or the buildings are undistinguished architecturally or historically, there will be no preservation attempt. Where warranted, however, structures will be carefully documented. To date, 30 structures have been recorded through measured drawings and photographs by Historic Buildings Survey and the program is continuing.

Corps: Features which may be permanently lost as a result of the construction of the dam and reservoir are:

a. The lower portion of the Old Copper Mine will be under 40 feet of water; the upper areas are above reservoir levels.

b. Some of the private dwellings, which although architecturally significant, are duplicated in style by others.

c. The Van Campen Inn, unless sufficient money is made available for restoration. While the building, in very poor condition, may be lost, the valuable antique interior features could be salvaged and restored for posterity.

d. The sites of Indian villages will be inundated by the reservoir.

e. Sections of Old Mine Road will be under water and lost permanently, however, large sections of it will remain. The monuments and plaques along the flooded sections can be moved to the remaining stretches of the road.

3. What structures, facilities or other features will be relocated to preserve their historical significance, how, and to what locations?

Int: Scientific studies by the National Park Service have identified thirty-one (31) structures within the flood zone that should be relocated. These, in addition to the Isaac Van Campen Inn and its early Dutch barn, include two (2) churches, one (1) school, eight (8) residences, one (1) gristmill, one (1) tobacco barn and sixteen (16) barns and smaller farm buildings. The gristmill, three residences and supporting outbuildings will go to Millbrook as a part of the restored village. The Abraham Van Campen house, Van Campen farmhouse, tobacco barn and other required outbuildings will be used to form an early historic farm complex in Warren County. A church, school and dependencies will be relocated to the historic Issac Stunk house to form a significant community grouping in Monroe County. Outbuildings will be relocated to the recently refurbished Slateford Farm in Northampton County while St. Johns Church, a charming gothic structure, will be relocated to higher ground in Pike County. Across the river in Sussex County, the Van Capen Inn and barn will be relocated to a site on an interpretive motor trail.

Corps: The number of structures, dwellings and other buildings which are to be saved and relocated will depend upon the determinations made by the National Park Service and other Federal agencies, such as

the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation authorized by Public Law 89-66J, 80 Stat 915. Many of the buildings tentatively designated as being significant could be physically relocated. Others at the upper limits of reservoir level could be protected by low earth embankments. All cemeteries subject to flood will be relocated. No determination has been made at this time as to the relocation site of any facility. (See Add below)

Add: As the Corps indicates, relocation sites for historical facilities will be determined by the National Park Service and other responsible Federal agencies. Some of the sites selected are cited in the Department of the Interior (National Park Service) response above.

4. What information has been developed to date regarding lost Indian burial grounds supposedly located on the western side of the Delaware between Tocks Island and Port Jervis? If evidence of their existence has been established, what will be done to protect those burial grounds or relocate them?

Int: Archeological surveys under auspices of the National Park Service, conducted by Franklin and Marshall College, Seton Hall University, and the New Jersey State Museum failed to identify Indian cemeteries on the west side of the Delaware between Shawnee and Port Jervis. Settlement sites are scattered throughout the valley and as they are excavated isolated graves have been located. Skeletal remains, in almost every instance, have been reduced to fragments by high soil acidity. Continuing archeological work may yet reveal one of the legendary Indian cemeteries, but in view of the extensive work already accomplished, this seems highly unlikely.

Corps: While there have been rumors of Indian burial grounds in the valley affected by Tocks Island Lake, professional archeologists employed under contract by the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, have not uncovered mass Indian burial grounds in the area. Selective testing has shown evidence of several large and small Indian settlements. Evidence of individual or small group burials, e.g., cremation remains, arm bands and other personal items, have been discovered at a few of these sites. Human remains, if found, and any others obtained from further investigations of these and other recommended sites could be gathered together and interred in one central area for posterity.

5. What other burial grounds, cemeteries, etc., lie within the project area and what is planned in relation to them? Relocation? Where?

Corps: There are many cemeteries and family burial grounds within the project boundary which require relocation in whole or in part. Of these, the Laurel Grove Cemetery in Port Jervis is the largest containing about 15,000 graves. About 500 graves must be relocated within this existing cemetery to permit future construction of flood protective works along the banks of the Delaware and Neversink Rivers. The second largest cemetery affected by project development is the Delaware Cemetery at Dingmans Ferry, Pennsylvania, containing about 1,500 graves. This cemetery and others containing from 200 to 300 graves must be entirely relocated. Additionally, about twelve smaller family plots ranging from a few to a maximum of 50 graves will also be wholly relocated.

Although areas for reinterment have not been selected they will be beyond the exterior boundary of the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. Required reinterments have been discussed with affected families and Cemetery associations. Further determinations of definite action is awaiting availability of funds. Submission of detailed plans and procedures is tentatively scheduled within the next 2 or 3 years.

6. What features of archeological signifi-

cance are known to exist in the area? What steps are being taken to preserve these, or to study them? Which will be lost by development, flooding or other causes related to project development?

Int: The Bevans Rock Shelter, located high above the shoreline of the reservoir, is the most important Indian remain in the national recreation area. It is located on the Flatbrook Peninsula tour road and will be preserved and interpreted. Smaller rock shelters, such as the one near Lake Lenape, will be interpreted also. Numerous settlement sites on the floodplain and on islands in the river have been scientifically excavated, artifacts recovered and information recorded. This work is continuing and before any of the area is flooded the archeologist will have recovered enough information to provide a detailed picture of the Indians' occupation and use of the valley. Sites outside the flood zone are not being disturbed. They can be studied in future years when time and possible technological advances will enable the scientist to extract more information from the sites than is now possible.

Corps: Archeological explorations are in process in the valley affected by the dam. Indian artifacts and shards have been found in many locations. All of the areas will be inundated by the waters of the lake. Explorations are intended to continue to salvage and save as many as are considered significant and valuable.

7. If not detailed elsewhere, what impact will the projects have on the pits, quarries, and shafts of the Pahaquarry Copper Mines and Old Mine Road which date to the early Dutch settlements of the 17th century?

Int: The Old Mine Road, according to tradition, was constructed about 1650 by Holland Dutch from the Pahaquarry Copper Mines northward 104 miles to Esopus, New York. Following the general alignment of old Indian trails on the east bank of the Delaware River, the lower end of the road held to the river valley, but above the Flatbrook it claimed higher up the ridge. Over the years, portions of the road, especially in low areas, have been relocated several times, making it impossible to say with certainty that any one of a number of parallel roads or road traces is the original. Ridge portions, where settlers built substantial stone houses and confined the road between massive stone rows, have unquestioned authenticity. Long stretches of the original road will be retained in its present condition or restored to its earlier appearance and interpreted. Roads on the floodplain will be inundated. The copper mines, consisting of three (3) relatively deep shafts, eight (8) minor shaft remains, later strip mines and remains of mine structures, are privately owned and closed to the public. The lowest of the three main shafts will be flooded, but all other remains will be made accessible and interpreted. The mines will be an important stop on the shuttleboat tour.

Corps: The Old Copper Mine will be flooded under about 40 feet of water. It cannot be saved. All gravel pits and quarries, laying in the present flood plain of the river, will be lost.

8. To what degree have local organizations having specific interests in historical and archeological matters such as these been consulted in regard to planning, or informed of planning?

Int: The recreation area staff has worked closely with archeological and historical societies of the region, seeking their advice and keeping them informed of our plans. On February 10, 1968, for example, an archeological planning conference was held at the recreation area. In attendance were more than 70 people representing all archeological and historical groups in the five-county area, institutions of higher learning, interested groups and individuals from through-

out the region, and governmental agencies on county, State and Federal level. Past archeological accomplishments in the valley were summarized, needs identified and programs formulated. This and planning sessions with similar groups having special interest in specific features within the park have had a profound effect on plans and programs.

Corps: The National Park Service has entered into numerous contracts for archeological explorations of the valley. These contractors have contacted local people, interested agencies, historical societies and other organizations in the area that are interested in archeological finds during the course of their investigations.

9. Are there any alternatives to the destruction of any historical features of the region? What do they entail and what are their estimated costs?

Int: Assuming that current plans will be carried to completion, only historical features of local significance, and which are duplicated or near-duplicated elsewhere, will be destroyed.

Corps: No alternatives are available for the preservation of archeological areas. These will be flooded. Structures and interiors of structures can be saved and restored or used as exhibits. Costs to date have not been estimated nor has the full extent of salvage operations been determined to date.

10. What costs are assigned to matters involving historical preservation, relocation, restoration, etc., as currently envisioned?

Int: The National Park Service has, in its five-year construction program, set aside \$1,713,300 for the purpose of rehabilitating and preserving historical and archaeological resources in its area. This does not consider the cost of relocation of structures to be saved from the reservoir area. That cost is attributable to the reservoir project and the Corps of Engineers should supply the figure.

Corps: The Corps has cooperated with the National Park Service in the surveys necessary to determine the extent of significant structures which may be worth saving. Information on total expenditures to date and an estimate of the additional funds required to set up a definite program would be under the jurisdictions of the National Park Service.

Add: A study of park project costs, above and beyond the original \$37 million authorization, is under way at the present time. The study is being made by private consultants in cooperation with the Corps and Park Service. As a result, funding details as they relate to historic facilities relocation are not yet available. Project costs will be the subject of a subsequent information report as part of this series.

#### PART 3—WATER SUPPLY AND POLLUTION CONTROL

The Tocks Island Reservoir is planned to provide 35 percent of the total water supply needs of the Delaware River Basin by the year 2010, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers stated in response to questions posed by four Congressmen representing the tri-state Tocks region.

The Corps also stated that "use of almost all known economically retrievable ground water supply" will meet only 12 percent of the water needs of the Basin's population by 2010.

Both the Corps of Engineers and the Delaware River Basin supplied information about water supply needs and downstream pollution control in this third Information Report on Tocks Island Dam issued jointly by Congressmen John G. Dow of N.Y., Joseph McDade and Fred B. Rooney of Pa., and Frank Thompson, Jr. of N.J.

According to the Corps, the least costly water supply alternative to the Tocks Island Dam would "entail construction of a joint

reservoir system with a major dam at Wallpack Bend (near Bushkill, Pa., and Flatbrookville, N.J.) on the Delaware and a secondary dam along the Flatbrook in New Jersey." The Corps estimated that water supply costs using the alternate reservoirs would be about three times greater than at Tocks.

The DRBC, meanwhile, reported that at the present level of technology, salt water desalination plants could meet Basin water needs at a cost 50 times greater than at Tocks.

Future water supply needs of Southeast Pennsylvania and Northern New Jersey would be served by the Tocks reservoir, beginning about 1978.

1. What communities will obtain water from the Tocks facility, according to the best information now available, and when will this source be required?

Corps: This project was originally formulated as a major element of a comprehensive basin plan of development of water resources which would assist in meeting the projected water supply needs of the Trenton-Philadelphia area to the year 2000. The Delaware River Basin Commission has resolved to purchase the 425,600 acre-feet of water supply storage at the project and would determine actual users of such storage. New Jersey, which has an ultimate need of 300 million gallons of water per day from the Delaware, has requested that the Commission consider its desire to use the project as a source of supply, starting in 1978. The actual allocation of water supplies from the project will be made by the DRBC.

DRBC: The water supply available from storage at Tocks Island Project will initially serve water-short areas in Southeastern Pennsylvania in Bucks and Montgomery Counties and in Northern New Jersey. The vital need of such storage was demonstrated during the drought period of 1965-67 when an emergency was declared in the Basin by the Commission which necessitated careful husbanding of the remaining supplies by the Commission and the establishment of conservation measures.

The Beltville Project, which will be operational in 1971, and contains 28,000 acre feet of water supply storage, will supply the Bucks and Montgomery County areas until about 1980 when Tocks Island Project will be required. Water requirements for those areas are estimated to reach 150 mgd by year 1995.

The Governor of New Jersey, in 1966, filled with the Commission a letter of intent to apply for as much as 300 mgd for diversion from the Basin to areas in Northern New Jersey. Only the Tocks Island Project, of those projects now included in the Commission's Comprehensive Plan, is capable of providing a water supply demand of that magnitude.

2. What alternate sources of water might satisfy the needs of those communities? How do the costs of water from those sources compare with costs of water from Tocks?

Corps: Based on previous project formulation studies, the least costly alternative to the Tocks Island project which would provide the same quantity of water supply storage within the same service area would entail the construction of a joint reservoir system with a major dam at Wallpack Bend on the Delaware and a secondary dam along the Flatbrook in New Jersey. Estimated water supply storage costs at this alternative site are about 3.0 times greater than at Tocks Island. A single desalination plant, based on maximum daily plant outputs and related costs expected within the near future, would not approach the daily water supply output and related costs of the Tocks Island Lake project.

DRBC: No alternative has been identified that compares favorably to the water supply costs of the Tocks Island Project. Other

alternative reservoir projects, which were analyzed by the Corps of Engineers, during the studies leading to HD 522 (Delaware River Basin Report) were considerably more costly in terms of unit water costs. The areas which will use Tocks Island water supply are areas where significant ground water resources are not available. While it is mentioned by some that salt water conversion is a possible alternative, the facts are that such an alternative would be as much as 50 times as costly under the level of current technology.

3. Can any projection be made of consumer costs of water taken from Tocks as opposed to some other source?

Corps: Specific knowledge of consumer costs for water supply within the basin could best be obtained from the Delaware River Basin Commission. Projecting estimated water supply storage costs at Tocks Island, presently estimated at \$0.01 per 1,000 gallons at July, 1970, price levels, and at the alternative source to 1980 indicates the alternative source would still remain 3.0 times greater in cost as construction cost increases would occur in the same proportion at each site.

DRBC: The exact cost of the water supply in the Tocks Island Project cannot be determined until the project is constructed and the final construction cost is known. However, a realistic estimate of the unit raw water cost is about \$0.02 per thousand gallons.

Add: It should be noted that the water cost figures supplied by the Corps and DRBC reflect two different time periods. The Corps' figure of \$0.01 per 1000 gallons is based on July, 1970, price levels while the DRBC figure of \$0.02 per 1000 gallons is a projection of the probable cost at time of completion, or about 1980.

4. How vital is the development of this water source in planning to adequately meet the water needs of the Basin's communities in the near future? In the year 2000 or beyond?

Corps: The project was formulated to provide for meeting 35 percent of the total basin water supply needs to be met by the entire Delaware River Basin Plan to the year 2010. In addition to this plan, which would develop means for using surface supplies of water, ground water sources of supply would be used to meet projected needs. By the year 2010, it is envisioned that 12 percent of the projected water supply needs of the basin would be met through use of ground water sources, representing use of almost all known economically retrievable ground water supplies. Formulated as part of the overall basin plan to meet projected needs in a timely and beneficial manner, this project would be required to be placed in service by 1975. The Delaware River Basin Commission is engaged in further refining projections of basin water supply needs.

DRBC: As indicated in the discussion of question one above, the Tocks Island Project is vital to meet the water needs of the Basin and Service Area in 1980. In addition, until the Tocks Island Project is on line, the problem of salinity intrusion in the estuary during drought periods remains. Such a problem was encountered in 1964 and 1965 when salinity intrusion threatened the usability of a portion of the water supply of the City of Philadelphia. Because the Tocks Island Project is the only main river development planned and it contains over one-half of the total water supply storage of all of the twelve major reservoir projects included in the Comprehensive Plan, it is the vital element in the Plan.

#### Pollution control

1. How will operation of the dam and reservoir assist the regulation of pollution levels in downstream portions of the main stem?

Corps: The project was not authorized to

be developed for the purpose of controlling pollution levels within river reaches downstream of the dam. It is not presently proposed to regulate releases from the lake for this purpose as control can more appropriately be achieved through treatment at the source. Enforcement of basin wide water quality standards previously adopted by the Delaware River Basin Commission should provide for control of pollution levels.

Impoundment of stream inflow should reduce concentrations of turbidity, stream sediment, color, hardness and bacteria in outflow from the lake. The lake will be regulated to provide for release of all lake inflows during April, May and June, other than flood flows, to maintain existing fresh water inflow contributions of the Tocks Island Lake drainage area to the Delaware Bay oyster planting and seeding beds, thus precluding other than natural development of objectionable chloride concentrations over those resources. Provision of water intake ports at various elevations of the structure used for releasing waters from the lake will permit selection of waters from any level or combination of levels within the lake to provide for maintaining proper temperature and dissolved oxygen concentrations of lake releases for downstream fishery resources and other aquatic life. Maintenance of a minimum average daily release of 2,784 cfs from the lake, to meet a basin water supply goal at Trenton, N.J., will also significantly lessen adverse effects caused during previously experienced prolonged lower stream flows, e.g., objectionable pollution levels, objectionable chloride concentrations in water used for water supply and inhabited by Delaware Bay oyster resources, and blockage or kills of migratory fish.

DRBC: The operation of the dam and reservoir will assist in the regulation of pollution levels in the non-tidal Delaware River by providing a minimum sustained flow of 3000 cfs at Trenton. This increased flow above current natural low flows will result in greater dilution of treated wastes and also higher river velocities. The ability of the river to assimilate treated wastes increases with increasing velocity by decreasing the transport time of wastes and increasing the rate that oxygen is dissolved in water. Increasing the rate that oxygen is dissolved in water provides more oxygen to stabilize organic wastes.

Add: While pollution control is not a principle purpose of the project from the Corps' standpoint, the DRBC's establishment of a minimum flow of 3,000 cubic feet per second at Trenton will help reduce pollution levels as described above.

2. What factors will determine when stored water will be released to reduce pollution downstream (salinity or other) to the detriment of recreational usage of the reservoir?

Corps: Water storage within the long term storage pool between elevations 356 and 410 will be jointly used for the purposes of water supply, hydropower and recreation. Release of storage from within this zone will be subject to the needs of the Delaware River Basin Commission and to the approval of the Corps of Engineers who has overall responsibility for regulation of downstream releases. Basically, as it is not an authorized project purpose, situations controlling releases for improvement of downstream water quality (dissolved oxygen, temperature, chloride concentration, oil spillage, etc.) cannot be predetermined and would have to be carefully assessed at the time of need. Careful weighing of pertinent factors would be required, e.g., degree of danger to public health or downstream water supply intakes, possible losses to fishery and marine resources, scheduled water supply needs, five-day forecast of weather and lake inflows, period of recreation day or season affected, elevation of lake, and daily amount and extent of period such re-

leases would be needed. During normal water years, lake releases would be controlled to limit the effect on daily fluctuation of lake levels during the recreation season. During drought periods, however, recreation may at times become a project purpose far outweighed in value by regional needs for water supply or for control of adverse stream flow effects.

DRBC: The Commission has established a flow objective of 3000 cfs at Trenton, N.J., to control ocean salinity in the Delaware Estuary during periods of low flow. The Commission Water Quality Standards have a stream objective of a maximum concentration of 250 mg/l of chlorides at the mouth of the Schuylkill River. This level is the upper limit of chloride recommended in the U.S. Public Health Service Drinking Water Standards. The chloride objective is based on protecting potable surface water supplies and under recharge aquifers in the Philadelphia-Camden region. Water storage is available in the reservoir to provide adequate releases even during periods of extreme drought. However, during such times, to protect potable surface and ground water supplies, draw-down would be required from the long-term storage for water supply and recreation.

Int: A minimum flow criteria should be established, perhaps the existing salt line could be used as this criteria.

3. What impact will pollution control standards established by the Delaware River Basin have upon the quality of water in the reservoir and upon recreational fishing in particular?

Corps: Enforcement of established basin and state water quality standards will enhance both the quality of water and recreational fishing both within upstream and downstream of the project boundary.

DRBC: The Standards will protect and maintain the quality of the reservoir for the stated purposes in the Standards. The basic premise of the standards are that "water uses shall be paramount in determining stream quality objectives which, in turn, shall be the basis for determining effluent quality requirements."

In addition, it is the policy of the Commission to maintain the quality of interstate waters, where it is better than established stream quality objectives, unless it can be affirmatively demonstrated that such a change is justifiable. The water quality in this area is currently excellent. By implementation of the Standards and the sewerage study discussed in Discussion 6 of Local Impact, the quality will be maintained.

The Standards includes in the uses to be protected wildlife, maintenance and propagation of resident game fish and other aquatic life, spawning and nursery habitat for anadromous fish and passage of anadromous fish. Stream quality objectives and treatment requirements in the Standards assure these uses.

**PART 4—PARK USE AND FACILITIES PROTECTION**

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior contend that adequately planned road systems and park utilization controls will enable millions of visitors to be accommodated by the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area surrounding Tocks Island Reservoir.

Planning for the anticipated influx of visitors and for protection of the dam, power project and park facilities are discussed by the Corps and Interior Department, as well as the Federal Power Commission, in response to questions posed by the four Congressmen representing the Tri-state Tocks region.

Both the Corps and Interior report on actual experiences with heavy utilization of public facilities around the country in this fourth in a series of Information Reports on Tocks Island Dam issued jointly by Congressmen John G. Dow of N.Y., Joseph McDade

and Fred B. Rooney of Pa., and Frank Thompson, Jr., of N.J.

"... It is recognized that the need for recreation within the service area of the project far exceeds the capability of this project to meet them, and consequently, controls of use, through a ceiling on visitation and a means of controlling ingress will afford the opportunity to manage visitation in terms of directing it to desired areas, or limiting it when capacity is reached," the Department of Interior explains.

Because park development is programmed over a 20-year period, planned water-related recreational facilities are expected to accommodate 4.2 million visitors days annually by 1980 and 9.6 million by 1990.

**Park Utilization**

1. Are existing and planned highway systems adequate to accommodate the number of visitors expected to utilize Tocks? What is the status of access highway development?

Corps: Yes. The 21 mile portion of U.S. Route 209 in Pennsylvania, from about 2 miles south of Bushkill, north to its intersection with U.S. Route 6 at Milford, which would be affected by project development and operations, is planned to be relocated roughly 1.5 miles west of its present route as a two lane class 2 highway. Construction of the initial section of the relocated route is planned to begin in the spring of 1973.

Planned additions to State Highway systems and the road network proposed to be developed within the Tocks Island Lake project boundary are being designed to support the expected visitor influx to the area. The Pennsylvania and New Jersey Departments of Transportation have completed preliminary highway needs studies within the project impact area. Schedules of improvements consistent with projected traffic needs and available highway funds are being developed in accordance with these impact studies. Completion of construction of Interstate Routes 84 and 80 north and south, respectively, and of Interstate Routes 287 and 81-E, east and west of the project, respectively, would provide the necessary exterior expressway network to maintain access to the project impact area. Interior trunk and connector roadways planned to be developed would provide primary traffic access into, through and within the actual impact area.

Int: For access to the area two interstate highways, I-88 and I-84, will serve the NRA at the lower and upper ends from the New York City area. The Northeast extension of the Pennsylvania Turnpike could be utilized to serve the NRA from the Philadelphia area.

To meet local transportation needs both the New Jersey and Pennsylvania Highway Departments have made highway master plans designed to provide adequate access to the DWGNRA as well as upgrade existing inadequate highways and provide for the future needs of the Tocks Island Region. In Pennsylvania the needs will be largely met by the relocation and upgrading of U.S. 209, which will be accomplished as a part of the Tocks Island Reservoir Project. In New Jersey the completion of I-80 and upgrading of U.S. 206 are under way, while the Foothills Freeway and other new routes are as yet in the planning stage.

Add: During the second Inter-agency Conference on Tocks, April 6, it was explained that Park Development is programmed over a 20-year period with completion anticipated in 1990. Thus, by 1980 the completed water-related park facilities would be expected to accommodate 4.2 million visitor days annually and by 1990 an estimated 9.6 million visitor days annually.

2. Is the projected 10,500,000 visitor days per year a reasonable level of utilization for a facility of this size? Will this level of utilization overtax the facilities which are planned and possibly lead to undue destruction of the park area's natural character?

Corps: Recreational development of river basin areas should be analyzed on an individual basis due to complex differences between both river basins and other types of existing recreational complexes around the country. Based on a joint determination by representatives of the National Park Service, the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the project resources capability was evaluated and it was conservatively estimated that these resources would attract and support an average annual usage of 10.5 million visitor days. Initial and ultimate visitation at water-related facilities would be 4.2 million and 9.6 million, respectively. The determination of these visitation estimates was predicated on such pertinent factors as soils, geologic factors, topography, vegetative cover, resource aesthetics, quality of planned facilities, location of major regional population centers, proposed highway networks, resource capacity and primarily the existing regional unfulfilled demand for public outdoor recreation facilities. A comprehensive land and water use management program provides for a long range plan of recreational development and for individual programs to control visitor impact on historic, scenic, scientific, flora, fauna and cultural resources located within the project boundary. As mentioned previously, the evaluated water-related recreational capacity of the project is planned to be initially developed to less than 1/2 of the resource potential. Experience gained from visitation to initial recreation areas would be used to guide future recreational development and control visitor impact on natural resources.

Int: The estimated 10.5 million visitation is a "soft" figure which is highly speculative. The "hard" statistic is design load which is the capacity of the area to accommodate visitors. This is expressed in terms of the maximum number of people who can be adequately provided for in the area at one time. The design load for DWGNRA, including water-related sites, is, in our Master Plan, 141,000 people. This reflects intensive recreation use which could, if inadequately planned for, contribute to the erosion of natural qualities. The Master Plan, however, concentrates most of this design load capacity in several areas which are to be well developed and intensively managed to sustain heavy recreation use. This frees most of the area from heavy use and contributes to the retention of natural character throughout. Land use within the total area, classified in the ORRRC categories is as follows:

**LAND CLASSIFICATION**

ORRRC class	Acres	Percent of total
I. High density recreation.....	1,000	1.4
II. General recreation (picnic areas, campgrounds).....	7,000	10.0
III. Natural environment (little development).....	29,000	42.0
IV. Outstanding natural areas (nature preserves).....	5,000	7.5
V. Primitive (minimal development).....	12,000	17.4
VI. Historic and cultural areas.....	1,000	1.4
VII. Water surface.....	14,000	20.3

This constitutes a reasonable balance between recreation development and preservation of the natural and cultural resource, and will not overtax the facilities which are planned, or lead to undue destruction of the park's natural character.

Add: The number of visitors to the various Park facilities will be limited to specified capacities by establishment of control points on the road system serving the project area. When capacity is reached at one facility on a given day, additional visitors will be directed to other facilities within the park by personnel at the control points.

Although disparity has existed for a number of years regarding Park Service and Corps plans for water-related recreational facilities, a memorandum of understanding has been drafted to resolve remaining differences.

3. How do size and projected utilization compare with other popular national parks? What problems relating to heavy visitation have been encountered at other popular parks and what steps were taken to remedy them?

Corps: The Corps of Engineers does not have basic responsibility for National Parks but has had vast experience with recreation attendance at developed water resource projects around the country. The following table lists several projects which offer either lake area, shoreline or recreational capacity similar to that offered at Tocks Island Lake.

#### WATER RESOURCE PROJECTS—CORPS OF ENGINEERS

State and reservoir name	Peak day attendance (thousands)	Water area (acres)	Shoreline miles
California:			
Whittier Narrows.....	41,500	64	2
Coyote Valley.....	48,000	1,662	14
Isabella.....	50,000	4,800	28
Texas: Benbrook.....	55,000	3,800	40
Kansas: Pomona.....	60,000	4,000	52
Missouri: Pomme De Terre.....	83,000	7,820	113
Texas: Whitney.....	101,400	15,800	135
Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York: Tocks Island Lake.....	148,800	12,425	100

<sup>1</sup> Represents capacity of initial facility development; ultimate water-related capacity is estimated at 112,000.

Natural resources within the above developed projects have not shown signs of excessive wear. Normal problems have been experienced at these projects such as use of certain facilities and traffic congestion at entrance stations. However, these problems have been alleviated through more frequent refuse collections, provision of additional facilities and development of improved traffic control programs.

Int: Yellowstone is the third largest national park in the system. Its 2,221,772.61 acres (including 2,035.73 acres of non-Federal land) are exceeded only in area by Glacier Bay National Monument and Katmai National Monument, both in Alaska. DWGNRA will have 68,828.00 acres.

The projected use of DWGNRA reflects an anticipation of more visitor use than presently experienced in any other National Park Service area. The advantages built into the planning at DWGNRA hinge around the fact that the intensity of use is anticipated. Therefore, it is recognized that the need for recreation within the service area of the project far exceeds the capability of this project to meet them, and consequently, controls of use, through a ceiling on visitation (the design load) and a means of controlling ingress (the entrance stations) will afford the opportunity to manage visitation in terms of directing it to desired areas, or limiting it when capacity is reached. In other parks where problems have become severe the problems were not anticipated in advance consequently visitor use patterns became problems because no suitable means of control were built into the management system. In the Northeast, we can assume extreme pressures in the direction of over-use and we can plan for its control from the beginning.

In Yellowstone, as in other parks, the major problem is the automobile. The traffic movement and congestion at heavy-use areas is not only frustrating to the visitor but creates considerable traffic control problems.

It is our immediate job and purpose to relieve, in one way or another, the causes for congestion and to spread visitor use out to other meaningful park values. One-way road systems, closures of selected sections to vehicular traffic, mass transportation systems, and other innovations have been implemented in Yosemite National Park. The effect has been to relieve congestion there, and we are implementing some of these methods in Yellowstone National Park as we are able. A bypass will be constructed in the Thumb area under a contract to be let this fiscal year. Plans also call for construction of a road to bypass the lake developed area. These projects will do much to alleviate traffic congestion of Yellowstone which occurs largely in the highly developed areas. Further, relocation of campground and concessioner facilities from areas of high visitor density is being accomplished as funds permit.

#### Protection of facilities

1. Some fear is being expressed that this dam and power project may become a target of revolutionaries or saboteurs. What degree of protection is planned for the dam, power plant, and other facilities?

Corps: Means of controlling public visitation within the project boundary and at project facilities would parallel those employed at other existing Corps of Engineers water resource projects around the country. Visitors will be restricted from entering those areas which in the opinion of the Corps of Engineers should not be open to the general public for security or safety reasons. Public access to the dam and appurtenant facilities will be restricted by appropriate fencing and controlled by security personnel. Guided tours of these facilities will be available to special interest groups. Basic rules and regulations governing public use and access within the project boundary and designation of areas prohibited to public access will be developed and placed on public display at appropriate locations. These data will also be referenced in informational project map folders provided to the visiting public. Security forces will be employed to insure public compliance with rules and regulations at principal project facilities and will patrol developed project lands.

FPC: The power plant, penstocks, and transmission lines will be constructed underground, thus providing a greater degree of protection from sabotage.

Add: In addition, the Park Service will provide protection for those recreational facilities under its management.

#### PART 5—FISH AND WILDLIFE

Forecasts that the Tocks Island Dam and Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area will afford sportsmen greater opportunities for fishing and hunting than if the region remained in private ownership are contained in the accompanying 22-page report on Fish and Wildlife released today by four Congressmen representing the Tristate Tocks region.

Also included in the report is information regarding Corps of Engineers plans for development of a fish passage to enable migratory species to pass over the dam, a table indicating the existing abundance of 46

kinds of fish and projecting their future in the 37-mile reservoir, and data regarding the Delaware Bay oyster industry.

In response to questions posed by Congressmen John G. Dow of New York, Joseph McDade and Fred B. Rooney of Pennsylvania, and Frank Thompson Jr., of New Jersey, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Department of the Interior and Delaware River Basin Commission report that planned programs of fish and wildlife resource management coupled with adequate access for sportsmen, will maintain good fishing and hunting opportunities.

"Without the project, public hunting would become virtually nonexistent and fishing access to the river would continue to diminish," the Department of the Interior contends.

Interior also warns that the threat of nutrient pollution poses a hazard to fishlife in the Delaware, with or without the dam, unless land development throughout the region is accompanied by installation of adequate sewage treatment facilities.

1. What impact will the combined dam and park projects have upon wildlife now known to exist in the region?

Corps: The 12,400 acre lake which would form at the top of the long term storage pool, elevation 410, will permanently inundate approximately 10,000 acres of land adjacent to the existing river causing a loss of terrestrial wildlife habitat existing within the affected area. Portions of 6,000 acres of land adjoining the long-term storage pool above elevation 410 would be periodically inundated for varying periods during flood control operations. These operations would cause an adverse impact on existing wildlife habitat within the described area. Recreational development and visitation to the project would also cause a reduction in the carrying capacity of range adjacent to recreational areas. Project impact on wildlife has been evaluated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in cooperation with the affected basin State's game agencies. Evaluation indicated a total annual projected loss of 750 hunter-days of deer hunting and 1880 hunter days of small game hunting could be expected with project development. These projected losses represent less than a 20 percent and 3 percent reduction in the potential annual deer hunting and small game hunting usage, respectively, of lands within the project boundary. Based on studies of these agencies, mitigation of the estimated losses will require the acquisition of 880 acres of additional project lands. These mitigation lands would total 450 acres in Pennsylvania and 430 acres in New Jersey.

Int: Wildlife habitats within the reservoir project total about 114 square miles, of which 97 percent is land. Estimated land acquisition for the reservoir amounts to 24,600 acres, of which about 12,000 acres lie above the conservation pool. Around this will be acquired 47,675 acres constituting the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. About 40 percent of the combined reservoir and park lies in Pennsylvania and 60 percent in New Jersey. The only loss of hunting opportunity which will occur will be within the reservoir area as a result of permanent or periodic inundation. These are summarized as follows:

#### AVERAGE ANNUAL HUNTER-DAYS

	Without the project		With the project		Difference	
	Pennsylvania	New Jersey	Pennsylvania	New Jersey	Pennsylvania	New Jersey
Deer.....	4,000	5,600	3,200	4,500	-800	-1,100
Small game.....	2,100	22,800	1,800	.....	-300	-400
Total.....	6,100	28,400	5,000	26,900	-1,100	-1,500

The reservoir project will inundate farm land which serves as a source of food for wildlife in many areas. The resource management programs in DWGNRA will mitigate these losses through agricultural programs accomplished with Vocational Agriculture and other education programs, the National Park Services' own management programs, and agricultural activities associated with demonstration farms. Wildlife will fare much better in the area under uniform management and development programs even with loss of habitat because of the reservoir than it would had private development progressed. Professional management of habitat and wildlife populations will result in perpetuation of all natural species now present and possible restoration of certain others. It is expected that there will be a net gain of wildlife resources and hunting opportunity within the National Recreation Area.

2. Is it likely that any significant changes will result in the varieties of wildlife which inhabit the area? If so, will these be desirable or undesirable?

Corps: Information has not been brought to our attention to date which would indicate the possibility of a significant change in wildlife varieties.

Int: No significant changes in the varieties of wildlife inhabiting the area are foreseen. However, waterfowl and birds associated with large bodies of water will increase.

3. To what degree will hunting be permitted within the project area and in what locations of what size?

Corps: Although hunting may be permitted under the terms of Public Law 89-158, plans for provision of posted hunting areas within the project area have not been formulated. Hunting, if it is considered compatible with other project purposes, would be provided in posted areas which would maintain public safety of visitors and recreationists at the project. Hunting would be regulated in accordance with other project activities and annual programs would be coordinated with Federal and State game agencies. The location of the estimated 880 acres of wildlife mitigation lands to be acquired for the project has not yet been determined by affected State game agencies. However, these agencies are desirous of acquiring mitigation lands adjacent to existing State wildlife management lands.

Int: Under the Master Plan for the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, which has been developed, only about seven percent of the total of 56,000 acres will be intensively developed for general recreation to the exclusion of hunting. The Master Plan includes provisions for the development of specific areas for wildlife management and public hunting and, when necessary, non-specific areas for controlled hunting to harvest surplus animals. The foregoing actions will be carried out in cooperation with the Pennsylvania Game Commission and the New Jersey Division of Fish and Game. In light of our present knowledge, however, it is expected that there will be a significant net gain of wildlife resources and hunting opportunity within the National Recreation Area.

It is presumed that lands and water areas within the reservoir site, amounting in all to about 24,600 acres, will be open to public hunting except for minor acreages reserved for reasons of safety, protection of public property, and the like. On the average, this means that about 10,700 acres of relatively unchanged habitat in the flood pool will be available, together with 3,800 acres more in which habitat will have been more or less modified by periodic inundation.

4. What fish are now found in the Delaware and how common are the respective varieties in relation to each other? What

change in the fish population are anticipated within five years of the dam's construction? Within 10 years? Within 20 years?

Corps: There are forty-six species of fish known to inhabit the reach of the river to be impounded. American shad are present in considerable numbers during migration periods. The river could aptly be described as a bass-walleye stream with the major river gamefish being the smallmouth bass closely followed in abundance by walleye. Rainbow, brown and brook trout are present in cool reaches of the river but primarily inhabit the cool, fast flowing tributary streams. Carp, sucker, bullhead and sunfish are found in abundance in the river with minor populations of goldfish, perch and fallfish. Red fin and chain pickerel are present but not common. Two additional species, northern pike and muskellunge are reported to have been stocked in the river. General information on anticipated changes in fish populations within this river reach after construction of the project is presented in the answer to question 7, following.

Int: The present game fish populations in the Delaware River are dominated by smallmouth bass and walleye. Among the panfish, the following are common to very abundant: brown bullhead, rock bass, several sunfish species, white and black crappies. The common to abundant forage fish now present include carp and goldfish, golden shiners, and several other minnows, quillback, white suckers, and banded killifish.

Naturally, with a change over to lake-type environment rather than stream, species better adapted to the former will gradually take over. This means that the following will increase and perhaps become overabundant: catfish and bullheads, rock bass, various species of sunfish, crappies, and yellow perch. The smallmouth bass will likely become rare, but it will be replaced by the now uncommon largemouth bass. Walleyes could continue to be an important species, provided adequate spawning habitat is available. Chain pickerel, now present, and northern pike, which may be introduced, could become abundant, provided suitable spawning habitat is available, and even the muskellunge might become an important part of the game fish populations. Of the forage fishes, those now common or abundant in the river will generally increase with exception of the cutlips and silvery minnows. Carp, goldfish, and white suckers could become abundant.

It is impossible to predict with any degree of accuracy the status of fish populations at specified dates of 5, 10, and 20 years. The shad, of course, will cease to be a sport fishing resource within the impoundment practically as soon as it starts to fill. Smallmouth bass will likely cease to be an important sport-fish within 5 years—the same could be true of walleyes if adequate spawning grounds are not present to provide for expanding its population rapidly to fill its potential niche in the reservoir fisheries. The first 5 years after filling should see development of an abundance of largemouth bass, pickerel and possibly northern pike. An abundance of food for expanding populations should result in an abundance of large panfish.

Within 5-10 years after filling, however, carp, goldfish, and sucker populations will probably reach the nuisance stage. Perch, crappie, and rock bass will probably begin to fall off in size, due to overabundance. Fishery conditions 10 or 20 years after impoundment will depend largely upon the success of management measures to control overabundance of carp, goldfish, and various panfishes and improve reproduction of game fish species.

The construction of the dam could lead to the development of a tailrace trout fishery, providing proper water flows and temperatures are established. It is expected that about 10 miles of the Delaware will provide suitable trout habitat.

DRBC: The fish now present and the abundance of each with respective anticipated changes in the fish populations are indicated in Table 3. (See Pages 39-40.)

It is difficult to predict what changes in fish populations may occur over 5, 10, or 20 years after the dam's construction. This, in part, will be dependent on a fish management program which will be carried out. Experience from other reservoirs and impoundments indicate overabundance of certain species such as carp, white suckers, perch, crappies, sunfish of various kinds, and various minnows and shiners appears certain, especially during the early years of the reservoir. Studies will have to be conducted to ascertain the change in fish populations of the various species and their control.

Forty-six kinds of fish have been identified within the reservoir site and the abundance of each kind of fish documented. The northern pike and the muskellunge have been stocked in recent years but very little information on the success of their introduction is known except that a few have been caught by fishermen. Knowing the life history, including the spawning habits of each kind of fish, and experience from other reservoirs, reasonable predictions can be made as to the outcome of each kind of fish.

Of the 46 kinds of fish now present in the Delaware River in the Tocks Island area 17 are considered abundant, while 16 are common and 13 occur occasionally or in a few cases might even be considered rare.

Reference to "abundant" is considered to be the most predominant species found at practically any location in the river; "common" would indicate those fish found at all locations, but not in very large numbers, and "occasional" refers to fish not found at all locations, few in number, and in some cases only found in selected areas of the reservoir site.

Of the 46 kinds of fish now present in the river, it is expected that all but six have the potential of remaining within the reservoir. Thirty-two species will undoubtedly remain in the reservoir, but the abundance of each kind of fish is subject to change. Of those remaining in the reservoir 20 are expected to increase, two decrease, and the rest are subject to little change or their outcome remains in question. Two species, the American eel and the American Shad, are dependent upon the installation of a fishway and their ability to negotiate it. Information based on experience from other such dams indicates these fish will be able to travel up over the fish ladder. Three species might become landlocked (trapped within the reservoir) such as the sea lamprey, alewife, and striped bass. Three kinds of trout, the rainbow, brook and brown, outcome remains in question and only time will tell. Temperature and dissolved oxygen will be the biggest limiting factor to trout.

It is expected that six fish (bridled shiner, common shiner, fathead minnow, blacknose dace, longnose dace, and the creek chub), all minnowlike, will disappear from the reservoir. In a recent study, however, all but the fathead minnow were found in most of the tributaries entering the reservoir. Even though these species of fish may disappear from the reservoir site, it is most doubtful that they will be lost from that area. The reason for the disappearance of these fish is because of the lack of fast flowing water and suitable spawning habitat.

TABLE 3.—(X) INDICATES PRESENCE IN CATEGORY DESCRIBED; (?) MEANS THERE IS SOME UNCERTAINTY, DIFFICULT TO PREDICT; AND (+ OR -) INDICATES EXPECTED INCREASE OR DECREASE]

Fishes	Preimpoundment			Postimpoundment			Fishes	Preimpoundment			Postimpoundment		
	Abundant	Common	Occasional	Disappear	Remain	Land-locked		Abundant	Common	Occasional	Disappear	Remain	Land-locked
1. Sea Lamprey	X				X	X	24. Creek Chub			X			
2. Alewife	X				X+	X	25. Fallfish				X		
3. American Shad	X				X		26. Quillback		X			X+	
4. Rainbow Trout			X	?			27. White Sucker	X	X			X+	
5. Brown Trout			X	?			28. Creek Chub Sucker			X		X+	
6. Brook Trout			X				29. White Catfish			X		X+	
7. Redfin Pickerel			X				30. Brown Bullhead	X				X+	
8. Chain Pickerel			X		X+		31. Channel Catfish			X		X+	
9. Goldfish		X			X+		32. Margined Madlom	X				X+	
10. Carp	X				X+		33. American Eel	X				X+	
11. Cutlips Minnow		X			X		34. Banded Killifish	X				X+	
12. Silvery Minnow		X			X		35. Striped Bass			X		X	
13. Golden Shiner	X				X+		36. Rock Bass	X				X+	
14. Comely Shiner		X			X		37. Redbreast Sunfish	X				X+	
15. Satinfin Shiner		X			X		38. Pumpkinseed	X				X+	
16. Bridled Shiner		X			X		39. Bluegill	X				X+	
17. Common Shiner		X		X			40. Smallmouth Bass	X				X?	
18. Spottail Shiner		X		X			41. Largemouth Bass	X		X		X+	
19. Swallowtail Shiner		X		X			42. White Crappie		X			X+	
20. Bluntnose Minnow		X		X			43. Black Crappie		X			X+	
21. Fathead Minnow		X	X	X			44. Johnny Darter	X				X-	
22. Blacknose Dace		X		X			45. Yellow Perch			X		X+	
23. Longnose Dace		X		X			46. Walleye	X				X?	

5. Is the Corps of Engineers firmly committed to provide some method of conveyance for anadromous fish (shad and other varieties) above the dam? What method is planned—a fish ladder, an elevator or other? What is its anticipated effectiveness? On what is this estimate based? Will its conveyance capacity have any limitation which might impair or restrict the potential shad migration in the Delaware?

Corps: The Corps of Engineers is planning fish facilities at the project to maintain passage of anadromous and catadromous species at the damsite. A preliminary design for a permanent fish ladder has been prepared which offers a capacity for handling an estimated annual migration of 250,000 fish or a maximum daily run of 25,000 fish. The design, which provides for passage of downstream migrants, is an adaptation of a system successfully employed at a hydroelectric dam located on the North Fork of the Clackamas River near Estacada, Oregon. Fish ladders installed at the complex of dams on the Columbia River have successfully passed migrations of up to 1/2 million shad to upstream spawning grounds.

Previous discussions with the Fish and Wildlife Service resulted in the mutual adoption of a program which would provide for, due to recognized problems confronting successful fish passage, installation of temporary facilities for passing shad during construction. These facilities would, if possible for the sake of economy, comprise the downstream portion of the full fish ladder design and would include means for attracting, trapping, sorting and trucking migratory species. Further mutual studies and actual experience with passing fish during construction would determine future migration counts and other pertinent factors which would govern the installation of the remaining portion of the permanent fish ladder or perhaps a different type of facility.

Int: The Congress, in authorizing Tocks Island and Reservoir, specified that a fishway should be provided at Tocks Island Dam "if it were found to be justifiable" by the Chief of Engineers. The fishway is a means of mitigating loss of the shad fishery (and of other anadromous or catadromous fisheries upstream from Tocks Island Dam). The legislative history of the 1958 Act amending the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as contained in Senate Report No. 1981, 85th Congress, 2nd Session, dated July 25, 1958, clarifies the intent of the Congress with regard to the term "justifiable." The Senate Report states:

"It is the understanding of your committee, however, that these measures (for the prevention of loss to fish and wildlife) would

not have to be justified under the usual benefit-cost type of analysis. They would not produce 'benefits'. These measures would be for reducing or compensating for the losses.

"Similarly, it is the understanding of your committee that 'estimation of wildlife . . . losses' provided for in the bill would not require a dollar evaluation."

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife believes that mitigation measures should, in fact, satisfy two criteria: first, that of practicability and second, that of reasonableness. Although it is evident that several problems specific to Tocks Island Dam, complicated to some degree by the addition of the pumped-storage operation, must be solved in the development of a satisfactory fishway at this dam, there is no reason to believe that any of these are insurmountable. As to the second point, we have no reason to doubt that an average run of 250,000 shad can and will be established and maintained with such fishway. A run of this size can mitigate the combined loss of insite and upstream shad-fishing opportunities to the extent of at least 50 percent—can mitigate the loss of upstream shad-fishing to the extent of over 93 percent.

On the basis of both practicability and reasonableness, the Bureau finds this means of mitigation of anadromous fishery losses to be fully justifiable and has so advised the Corps of Engineers. In view of this and the Congressional authorization, we find no reason for thinking otherwise than that the design and operation of a satisfactory fishway constitutes an integral part of the plan for Tocks Island Dam, for which the Corps of Engineers has primary responsibility as the construction agency.

Certain preliminary designs have been developed by the Corps of Engineers and reviewed by the State and Federal fish and wildlife agencies. It appears that further design studies will be directed toward development of a satisfactory fishway, i.e., a fish ladder. It will be designed to permit movement of at least 250,000 shad upstream during the average annual permit when the upstream run is in progress. The design parameters for such a fishway will be developed by engineers of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and the Corps of Engineers, based upon design and operational experience with shad movements on both the west and east coasts. There would appear to be no foreseeable limitation to conveyance capacity which would impair or restrict the potential shad migration in the Delaware River.

6. If a fish ladder is planned, as opposed to the elevator device such as is employed at Holyoke Water Power Company on the Connecticut River in Massachusetts, will it pro-

vide any means to purge trash fish, sea lampreys or the like?

Corps: The presently designed permanent fish ladder would provide means of sorting and removing objectionable trash fish. The actual program for purging of the various species of trash fish will be coordinated with the basin State's fish agencies as part of the fishery management program for the lake. Catadromous eels within the affected portion of the river support a small commercial fishery in New York State and as such attempts will be made to preserve and not purge this species.

Int: Control of "trash fish" or lampreys at the fishway probably would not be a very efficient method of handling such species. Actually, it is likely that any over population of "trash fish" would be due to build-up of populations already in the reservoir site—carp, goldfish, white suckers, etc. Alewives could also become over abundant—so could yellow perch and crappies. These will need to be controlled by techniques applied within the reservoir waters. Lampreys are present and can become landlocked. Unless there is a population explosion of this species such as occurred in the Great Lakes, the presence of lampreys does not constitute a serious constraint on game fish population. If a population explosion were to occur, it could be brought under control by chemical treatment of the tributaries, as is being done in the Great Lakes area.

7. What dangers exist that the dam will lead to decline of sport fishing potential and gradual takeover by trash fish varieties?

Corps: According to joint studies of the Fish and Wildlife Service and the affected basin State's fish agencies, the resident game fishery will expand rapidly within the lake and would produce excellent sport fishing for a period of 6 to 10 years following impoundment. Following this period, the fishery is expected to change from an outstanding to a good sport fishery due to expected increases in rough fish populations. Seining areas to be established along the lake shoreline and a lake drawdown program during rough fish spawning periods are expected to be capable of controlling rough fish populations which, without such programs, would have a tendency to overpopulate the lake. In addition to these programs, further control will be provided by sorting operations at the proposed fish passage facilities. After the initial primary 10 year harvest period, the lake would still maintain a good sport fishery with game, pan and rough fish represented in the catch.

Int: The replacement of 40 miles of Delaware River, 9.5 miles of Flat Brook, 4 miles of the Bushkill, and 2.5 miles of Neversink

River by a 12,400 acre lake (at elevation 410) will naturally result in a readjustment in the relative abundance of the various species. Certain forage fish, such as carp, goldfish, white suckers, and alewives, with their tremendous reproductive potentials and the favorable conditions provided by the lake, may become more numerous than desirable from the standpoint of maintaining optimum sport fishing conditions. The same is true with regard to such panfish species as yellow perch, black and white crapples, and sunfish. If nature is not to take its course and the goal is to maintain as high a percentage of the biomass as possible in the form of game fish species, management measures will be necessary.

Even considering, however, that no special management measures are instituted, it is estimated that the reservoir lake will be able to attract and sustain annual fishing use to the extent of 384,000 man-days annually. Such use will not materialize, however, without adequate access distributed strategically around the reservoir perimeter. Such access sites should include boat ramps and parking lots in sufficient number and area to accommodate a total of 3,000 cars and boat trailers in any one day.

Failure to realize the full sport fishing potential incidental to construction of Tocks Island Dam and Reservoir will not come from decline in sport fishing potential and gradual take-over by "trash fish" but could come through failure to provide adequate access to the better fishing locations.

8. What impact will the dam have on oyster production, or other commercial fishing activities in or near the bay area? What has been the annual oyster production for each of the last 30 years in the Delaware, and what is the outlook for the oyster industry with or without the dam development?

Corps: During April, May and June, the lake will be operated to provide for downstream release of all lake inflows, other than flood inflows, to maintain natural stream flows over the oyster beds in upper Delaware Bay. With the lake operated in this manner during this period, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and Bureau of Commercial Fisheries have concluded that project development and operation will cause no damage to the Delaware Bay oyster industry.

Information on past commercial oyster production in Delaware Bay and future expectations can best be obtained from the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Recent shad migrations in the Delaware have been estimated to be in the range of 100,000 fish. Studies by the Fish and Wildlife Service indicate potential future annual shad migrations of 250,000 fish.

Since 1920 the commercial harvest of shad in Delaware River and Bay has averaged around 245,000 pounds. Adoption and enforcement of water quality standards by the Delaware River Basin Commission and the basin States, however, is expected to improve stream water quality and thus revive the shad fishery. The estimated average annual commercial harvest of shad, presently at low levels due to pollutional effects, is projected to be 1.5 million pounds without the lake project.

Int: The dam can be operated in such manner (without significant detriment to other project purposes or benefits) as to not affect oyster production in Delaware Bay. This was determined as a result of studies by representatives of Rutgers University, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Corps of Engineers in the fall of 1968. As a result, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior advised the Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Works, House of Representatives, December 26, 1968, "... it has been determined that the reservoir can be operated in such a manner as to prevent damage to the seed oyster re-

sources of Delaware Bay. We concur in these findings.

"We understand that the Corps of Engineers plans to modify the project rule curve and project operations to accommodate our recommendations, for prevention of losses to this valuable resource. . . ."

Seed oyster production on the natural seed beds in Delaware Bay is subject, of course, to limitations resulting from various factors. Some of these are of a relatively temporary nature, although capable of wreaking considerable havoc while they are active. Others, like the oyster drill, are present and do damage in varying degrees from year to year. These temporary or continuing adverse factors cause considerable fluctuation in seed oyster production from year to year, as is evident from the table below showing annual seed oyster production in Delaware Bay for the past 30 years.

Damage to the oysters in any given year is directly proportional to the abundance of drills and that abundance, in turn, depends upon the successful hatching of young drills. At the time the embryonic drills are developing in the egg cases, they are extremely vulnerable to salinities lower than 15 parts per thousand. The period of greatest egg-laying activity extends from May 15 through June 30.

Data on distribution of salinity levels in the oyster-producing areas have been collected intensively since 1927 from 31 regular sampling stations established by the New Jersey Oyster Research Laboratory. For some of these stations, several hundred salinity values are available. While the primary controlling factor is the total freshwater inflow to Delaware Bay, flows at Trenton gage provide a usable index, which can be correlated with salinities over the beds (total inflow averages about 1.6 times flow at Trenton). Analysis has shown that the salinity at any given station on any given date reflects the mean flow at Trenton gage over the preceding 30-day period.

As long as Tocks Island Dam and Reservoir is operated so as to retain no inflow to the reservoir between April 1 and June 30 of each year (except for control of floods in excess of channel capacity), reservoir operation would have no effect upon salinities in the oyster-producing areas between May 1 and July 1. Thus, reservoir operation would not significantly affect either drill abundance in the seed bed area or production of seed oysters.

It is not expected that Tocks Island Dam and Reservoir will adversely affect other commercial fishery resources in or near the bay area, with exception, of course, of reduction in shad populations due to inundation of spawning and nursery habitat within the reservoir site and possibly in the reach downstream from the dam. The average annual harvest of 1.5 million pounds of shad will be reduced to about .5 million pounds.

The following table, based on landings of commercial oysters in New Jersey and data collected by Rutgers University, provides an index of productivity of oysters in the Delaware River area. It should be noted that the taking of seed oysters has been prohibited during some years due to the presence of MSX, a disease that attacks oysters.

Year	Market oysters (total pounds marketed)	Pounds per bushel	Seed oysters (number of bushels)
1940	5,941,800	6.65	(1)
1941	(1)	(1)	(1)
1942	5,521,500	77.6	611,300
1943	6,024,300	(1)	487,500
1944	5,640,300	6.66	253,600
1945	7,747,400	79.6	(1)
1946	7,747,800	(1)	(1)
1947	5,253,000	7.00	(1)
1948	5,988,300	7.00	(1)

Footnotes at end of article.

Year	Market oysters (total pounds marketed)	Pounds per bushel	Seed oysters (number of bushels)
1949	7,085,700	7.00	(1)
1950	7,241,800	6.00	(1)
1951	5,761,300	6.00	(1)
1952	7,993,800	7.50	(1)
1953	8,484,000	8.00	400,000
1954	7,329,000	8.00	350,000
1955	5,204,000	8.00	(2)
1956	5,503,000	8.00	522,000
1957	2,720,000	6.50	(1)
1958	829,000	4.75	450,000
1959	207,000	6.40	(3)
1960	167,000	7.00	(2)
1961	1,100,000	7.40	166,000
1962	1,554,000	(1)	172,000
1963	516,000	7.49	(1)
1964	1,098,000	7.00	171,000
1965	523,000	6.20	(2)
1966	695,000	6.00	227,000
1967	1,027,000	6.09	142,000
1968	1,320,200	(1)	145,000
1969	1,046,000	(1)	82,000
1970	(1)	(1)	123,000

<sup>1</sup> Unknown.  
<sup>2</sup> MSX.  
<sup>3</sup> Closed.  
<sup>4</sup> Closed-1.

DRBC: The most important factor associated with the Tocks Island Dam and oyster production is the fresh water flow into Delaware Bay during the spring of the year. At this time the predaceous snail, better known as the oyster drill, feeds upon and destroys large numbers of oysters. By reducing the salinity over the oyster beds the control of the oyster drill is possible.

According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, it was determined that mitigation of oyster damages could be achieved through maintenance of historical stream flows over the oyster beds during and immediately prior to the reproductive period of the oyster drill. The Fish and Wildlife Service has requested modification of the rule curve operation of the reservoir to allow for release of reservoir inflows during the period from April 1 to June 30 of each water year. According to the Corps, modification of the rule curve as requested by the Fish and Wildlife Service will result in no damages to oysters being attributed to the operation of the reservoir during this period. If this schedule of releases is met, however, there is reason to believe that the long-range benefits to the oyster might occur.

Oyster productivity in the State of New Jersey has ranged from 23,000,000 pounds (7 pounds of meat=1bushel) in 1887 to less than 100,000 pounds in 1960 (Table 1 for oyster productivity during the past 30 years has been omitted from this report because it could not be reproduced in quantity.) From 1940 to 1950 a steady yield of approximately 6,500,000 pounds occurred followed by a drastic decline from 1955 to 1960 to less than 100,000 pounds. Since 1960 a gradual but rather steady increase occurred with an average production of about 950,000 pounds from 1960 to 1966.

Comparative figures for oyster production in Delaware Bay for the States of Delaware and New Jersey are included in Table 2.

TABLE 2.—OYSTER PRODUCTION IN DELAWARE BAY

Year	Delaware		New Jersey	
	Pounds	Amount	Pounds	Amount
1950	2,141,000	\$911,800	7,241,800	\$2,897,247
1951	2,266,000	1,047,660	5,761,300	2,405,681
1952	2,252,300	1,150,925	7,933,800	3,397,369
1953	3,142,000	1,565,000	8,484,000	4,119,000
1954	4,340,000	2,726,000	7,329,000	3,634,000
1955	3,290,000	1,603,000	5,204,000	2,603,000
1956	1,893,000	783,000	5,503,000	3,023,000
1957	4,194,000	2,227,000	2,720,000	1,782,000
1958	2,410,000	1,717,000	829,000	675,000
1959	295,000	158,000	267,000	190,000
1960	177,000	119,000	167,000	161,000
1961	33,000	18,000	1,100,000	934,000

TABLE 2.—OYSTER PRODUCTION IN DELAWARE BAY—  
Continued

Year	Delaware		New Jersey	
	Pounds	Amount	Pounds	Amount
1962....	80,000	\$60,000	1,554,000	\$1,423,000
1963....	41,000	25,000	516,000	558,000
1964....	44,700	26,984	1,097,700	1,024,410
1965....	34,100	28,000	523,100	713,637
1966....	45,000	37,000	695,000	796,000

With or without the project present research activities such as the breeding of disease-resistant oysters, the relationship of river flow to bay salinity, and the off-bottom system of raising oysters attached to strings suspended from rafts appear encouraging.

9. Will the dam development, or operation of the recreation area, have any impact on recreational fishing? For example, by what reason would it be necessary for Pennsylvania residents fishing either the river or reservoir to secure non-resident fishing licenses from the State of New Jersey? What action, legislative or otherwise, would be required to enable any Pennsylvania, New Jersey or New York fisherman to fish any part of the river or reservoir from his own State's shores, or by boat from his own State's shores, with nothing more than his own State's fishing license?

Corps: In accordance with Public Law 89-158, the Delaware Water Gap National Recreational Area will eventually include the lands and waters adjacent to Tocks Island Lake. The Secretary of the Interior, through the National Park Service, has developed a preliminary land and water use management plan for the National Recreational Area which incorporates a fishery management program for the lake. This program would be coordinated with other authorized project purposes. The National Park Service plans to develop, in coordination with State fish agencies and the Corps of Engineers, a fishing program which would provide for continuation of uniform State fishing regulations and reciprocal recognition of either State's fishing licenses on waters of the lake and downstream of the dam. The specific legislative actions required by each state to join in such an agreement are now known at this time.

Int: The National Park Service has met jointly with Pennsylvania and New Jersey to discuss this. The States have a reciprocal agreement which permits a New Jersey fisherman to fish the river on either side of the imaginary State Line (middle of river) as long as his point of entry is from the New Jersey side and he does not stand on the Pennsylvania shore. Similar conditions apply to Pennsylvania fishermen. Both states agree that the same condition would apply to the reservoir and it would continue to apply to the river.

DRBC: It is not expected that the development of the dam or operation of the recreational areas will have any significant effect on recreational fishing. In the 15,000 acre reservoir it is estimated that 100 pounds of catchable fish per acre or 1,500,000 pounds per year may be caught. As many as 200 fishing days a year with a fisherman load of 5000 per day can be expected.

Reciprocal fishing and boating license agreements have been established for the Delaware River where it forms a common boundary between Pennsylvania and New York, and Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

Fishing licenses of either state will be recognized in the Delaware River from water's edge to water's edge and fishermen will be permitted to take off in a boat from either shore and on returning to have in possession any fish which might be legally taken. However, any person fishing from the shore must obtain a license in that state on whose shore fishing is done. The National Park Service will permit fishing within the Delaware Water Gap Natl. Recreation Area, where the state fishing laws will apply.

10. There have been concerns that construction of the dam, coupled with certain pollution conditions within the reservoir, or reservoir fluctuations, would produce an algae growth which would destroy or seriously harm fish life within the reservoir. What justification is there for such concern, and what assurances can be offered that this will not occur?

Corps: Due to the depth of the reservoir, the selective withdrawal system, the relatively short detention time of the water in the lake and the cold water inflow from upstream impoundments it is felt that algae growth will not be a significant problem. Enforcement of the recently established water quality standards by the Delaware River Basin Commission will further decrease the danger of eutrophication.

Int: There is little justification for such concern. Present water quality at Port Jarvis and on down to the Tocks Island site is excellent. The reservoir will not be a stagnant pool. There is no reason to expect a high level of eutrophication, such as might create noxious algae blooms.

These concerns are probably related to the lands outside the project which are subject to development, and are being developed creating the potential for nutrient laden, if not polluted water, to find its way into the reservoir. These nutrients could contribute to the growth of algae and other vegetation whose decomposition would lower the dissolved oxygen content of the water with resultant harmful effects on fish life. The same threat exists to the river with or without the project. Adequate sewerage treatment requirements, as reflected in the Delaware River Basin Commission's TIRES report is a positive approach toward preventing this problem.

DRBC: Algae growth is not expected to destroy or significantly affect fish within the reservoir. Such problems as algae protecting large numbers of small fish making them unavailable to larger fish as food, toxic properties of some species of algae, and oxygen depletion at the time of algae die-off are well recognized in fishery management. It is difficult to predict precisely what will occur because every impoundment is likely to be a little different. Algae and fish related problems are not apt to be a problem where there is a large surface area, good wind action, good depth of water and high quality tributaries entering the reservoir.

Nutrients are mainly responsible for algae growths or "blooms." They are being studied at the present time and precautions are being taken to minimize the problem.

11. How does the project's impact upon fish

and wildlife compare with the impact anticipated if the project were abandoned and the region developed by private interests?

Corps: According to joint studies of the Fish and Wildlife Service and the basin State's game agencies, projected population increases within the region and the related development which it brings would reduce the game habitat within the project area under a no project concept. Some losses in habitat were expected to be offset by planned increases in State game land holdings and improved wildlife management practices. Despite these offsetting factors, study results indicated private lands now available for hunting or management within the project area including the National Recreation Area, would be reduced over the life of the project by 19 percent in Pennsylvania and 39 percent in New Jersey.

Project development would cause a reduction in available wildlife habitat which would represent less than an 8 percent loss of the total potential hunter-day usage within the project boundary.

Int: Numerical comparison of fishery capability in terms of fisherman use and commercial harvest is as follows:

Man-days	Sport fisheries without project	Resident fishes	
		With project	Difference
Within reservoir site.....	70,000	1384,000	+314,000
Upstream from site.....	90,000	90,000	0
Downstream from dam.....	130,000	63,000	-67,000
Total.....	290,000	537,000	+247,000
	Sport fisheries without project	Anadromous fishes	
		With project	Difference
Within reservoir site.....	35,000	—	-35,000
Upstream from site.....	40,000	37,500	-3,500
Downstream from site.....	50,000	25,000	-25,000
Total.....	125,000	62,500	-62,500
	Commercial fish without project	Shellfish	
		With project	Difference
Pounds of shad.....	1,500,000	500,000	-1,000,000
Bushels of oysters.....	1,500,000	1,500,000	0
Pounds of eels (N.Y.).....	10,000	10,000	0

1 With recommended access provided.

2 With fishway and average annual run of 250,000.

3 Without fishway, total loss would be 100,000 man-days.

4 Provided no runoff is stored between April and June 30.

5 With fishway (contrary to Aug. 4, 1965, report of Fish and Wildlife Service).

#### NUMERICAL COMPARISON OF WILDLIFE RESOURCE CAPABILITY IN TERMS OF HUNTER DAYS

	Without project		With project		Difference	
	Pennsylvania	New Jersey	Pennsylvania	New Jersey	Pennsylvania	New Jersey
Deer.....	4,000	5,600	3,200	4,500	-800	-1,100
Small game.....	2,100	22,800	1,800	22,400	-300	-400
Total.....	6,100	28,400	5,000	26,900	-1,000	-1,500

In connection with hunting, posting against trespass is prevalent and is expected to increase. Large tracts of land are under lease to sportsmen's clubs and other groups. Predicted increases in human population in the area will result in considerable reduction of game habitat due to intrusion of residential and business development. The States' plan is to increase the extent of land and water areas to permit public hunting and fishing. It is anticipated, however, that private lands now available for hunting or wildlife production will be reduced by 19 percent in Pennsylvania and 39 percent in New Jersey during the life of the project. This attrition will continue; it seems safe to assume that the use indicated with the

project will remain relatively constant for a period of time far in excess of the so-called life of the project.

Without the project, public hunting would become virtually nonexistent and fishing access to the river would continue to diminish.

DRBC: With the project there is very little danger that any of the kinds of fish, animals, birds and plant life will be completely lost from the immediate environs of Tocks Island or the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. Much of the present habitat in the reservoir site will be lost to many terrestrial forms of life and replaced by greater numbers of fish and water fowl.

The development of areas such as this by private interests have not always afforded

the best protection in the past to fish and wildlife. Also, many areas like Tocks Island under private management have been available to too few people. Tocks Island is greatly needed from just a recreational standpoint.

12. How will pumped storage operations affect fish propagation? What are the results of the study initiated by the Delaware River Basin Commission?

Int: It is not expected that such operation will seriously affect resident populations. The study initiated by the Delaware River Basin Commission would seem to bear this out. Effects of the pumping-generating cycle on anadromous fish on either upstream or downstream migrations could be a problem. The need for protective devices will receive intensive study as plans develop further.

At the present time, numbers of shad in the Delaware River, seasonally within or moving through the Tocks Island site, are not known precisely. On the basis of cursory sampling efforts and records and estimates of harvest by sport fishermen, it is estimated that without the project, an average annual run of at least 500,000 shad can be anticipated without Tocks Island.

Plans which have been worked out with the Philadelphia District Corps of Engineers promise to make possible accurate counts of upstream migrants passing the site during the initial construction phase. This should yield at least 4-6 years of accurate information. It is to be expected that there will be wide variation in numbers from year to year. There are many factors beyond control which will affect reproduction and survival in the stream and others which cannot be managed or predicted will have an impact on the population while in the open sea. For example, on-going studies of juvenile shad in Delaware River (under the Anadromous Fish Restoration Program) indicate that the 1970 year class produced far more juveniles than did that of 1969. The reasons for this are not known for sure.

DRBC: Normal, expected daily fluctuations from pumped storage operations during the fish spawning season of April, May and June will be about 0.8 foot (9 inches). Such a fluctuation will not adversely affect fish propagation, a three-year DRBC study showed.

The fish results of the DRBC study (Limnological Effects of simulated pumped-storage operation at Yards Creek, February 1971) are as follows:

**Nest building and behavior**—Most nest-building fish constructed nests, however, a smaller number of nests were found in fluctuating ponds than in the control pond. A number of fish nests were exposed by abnormally large fluctuations, with some loss of eggs. Both the walleye and the yellow perch, non-nest builders, spawned in fluctuating and control ponds, although in small numbers (the walleyes were gravid when introduced).

**Reproduction**—Production of juvenile fish was very low in 1968, but increased considerably in 1969. Greater numbers of juveniles occurred in the control pond in 1969; however, in the same year two of the fluctuating ponds showed greater total weight.

**Survival**—The survival of adult fish was similar in all ponds; differences which occurred did not appear to be attributable to fluctuation in water level. The survival of the 1968 zero-year class large-mouth bass was approximately 4 percent in 1969. Less than 1 percent of the zero-year class bluegills of 1968 survived in 1969. For the rest of the species of juvenile fish the data was either insufficient or inconclusive.

**Relative condition factor**—The relative condition factor decreased for the large-mouth bass, smallmouth bass, and walleye—however, they were gravid (laden with eggs and milt) at the time of stocking; remained about the same for the pumpkinseed and

rockbass; and increased for the bluegill and brown bullhead in all ponds. The relative condition factor showed less change for most fish in the control pond than in the fluctuating ponds. In no case was the relative condition factor observed to be appreciable less than might be expected normally.

CONCLUSION

It was concluded that fish adapted to the uniform regime of water level fluctuations and were successful in spawning and hatching of eggs. No unusual problems were apparent in the early development and growth of fish. The slight decrease in recruitment of fish observed in this study could be beneficial in most natural situations.

It was further concluded that the measurable effects observed in plankton and macroinvertebrate productivity, plant colonization, relative condition factor of fish, and physical and chemical properties of the test ponds had no marked effect on the fish populations therein.

PART 6—RESERVOIR FEATURES AND FLOOD CONTROL

The expected impact of flood and drought conditions and of siltation upon the operation and recreational use of Tocks Island Reservoir is described by the Corps of Engineers and the Department of Interior in this sixth Information Report on Tocks Island Dam issued by four Congressmen representing the tri-state Tocks region.

According to the Corps, "Since accumulation of sediment is not expected to be significant and no removal is anticipated, the recreational use of the reservoir is unaffected by sedimentation considerations."

The Corps also reported that during a flood of the intensity expected to occur once in 50 years, the normal reservoir pool of 12,400 acres would be enlarged by 4,375 acres.

However, flood water storage is short-term storage to avert flood damage and excess water stored during such periods would be released within a brief period of time, the Corps explained during a second Inter-Agency Conference on Tocks Island held April 6th.

The Information Report, issued jointly by Congressmen John G. Dow of N.Y., Joseph McDade and Fred Rooney of Pennsylvania, and Frank Thompson Jr. of N.J., also indicates that recreational facilities such as beach areas and boat ramps are designed for continued use during periods of moderate flooding and substantial drought. The report does caution that recreational usage will be curtailed somewhat during either severe flooding or extreme drought.

1. The normal lake is planned to cover an area of 12,400 acres. Based on past flood experience on the Delaware, with what frequency and to what extent in terms of additional acreage will the 12,400 acre pool be exceeded?

Corps: Due to flood control operations, the 12,425 acre pool at elevation 410 will increase in area by the following amounts with the listed frequencies:

Frequency	Maximum pool elevation (feet)	Total lake area maximum pool (acres)	Increase in lake area (acres)	Percent increase in lake area
Once in 10 years...	424.0	15,200	2,775	23
Once in 25 years...	426.2	15,700	3,275	27
Once in 50 years...	430.6	16,800	4,375	35

2. Based on Delaware Basin drought experiences, what portion of the reservoir area will be exposed during droughts of the severity anticipated once in five years, 10 years, 20 years, 50 years?

Corps: In discussions of droughts as compared to floods, one must consider the added dimension of time, i.e., length of the sustained condition. Historically there are rela-

tively few drought events. Therefore, the process of trying to develop a statistical frequency curve with few data and varying length is extremely difficult. It has been estimated that the drought of 1930-31 of a 30-month duration would occur about once in 15 years while the 1961-67 drought has a once in 400 years recurrence. Information has been developed which relates to summer drawdown events which would have been experienced at the project during past stream flow conditions. These data are based on an analysis which simulated operation of the project using 52 years of recorded stream flows and the proposed lake operation program. During the primary 14-week summer recreation season, the operational program for the lake would cause a total average drawdown of 7 feet by the end of summer. The average rate of drawdown expected during the same period would approach one inch per day. With the lake at elevation 410 at the beginning of the summer recreation season, the percent chance of occurrence and the acreage of exposed previously submerged soils related to selected drawdown events is presented as follows:

Drawdown event (feet)	Percent chance of occurrence	Total area exposed (acres)
2	98	360
5	77	890
7	50	1,240
10	40	1,780
15	25	2,660
19	10	3,350
20	4	3,520

3. What portions of this exposed acreage will be sand-covered beach area and what portion might be described as mud flats?

Corps: It is incorrect to assume that drawdown of a water surface, to any degree, is synonymous with the term "mud flats." This term should not be used to designate all types of objectionable soil conditions. Soil conditions which may be objectionable to some recreationists may not be to others. Almost 80 percent of the shoreline within the summer drawdown zone is steep-sloped and not subject to retention of water. The majority of soils along the remaining flat-sloped shoreline are free draining and would not produce objectionable soil conditions. The average daily rate of drawdown and provision of concrete boat ramps and sand covered slopes at beach and boat beaching areas would preclude development of objectionable soil conditions within recreation areas. Outside selected recreation areas, objectionable soil conditions could develop within small scattered areas along the lake shorelines; there is no program proposed at this time for prevention of such conditions in these areas. Where further investigation of the lake's shoreline reveals a potential for development of extensive objectionable soil conditions which would seriously detract from the overall recreational use of the lake, a sculpturing or drainage program will be developed to mitigate these effects. Although final design has not been completed, about 300 acres of the exposed area will constitute sand-covered beaches and boat ramps.

4. What acreage of "mud flats" was exposed along this 37-mile segment of the river at the height of the five-year drought of the 1960's?

Corps: Without a definition of the term "mud-flat," it is difficult to reply to this question. However, existing average daily fluctuations (0.5 to 1.0 feet) of the river reach within the project boundary are greater than those which would be experienced with Tocks Island Lake. Extreme fluctuations also occur under drought conditions and may be more pronounced. Thus, it is difficult to reconstruct an area of exposure without exact records. A one-foot

drawdown would expose about 300 acres of the normal 2,400 acre river area (within the project boundary).

Int: The Corps of Engineers can possibly answer this question, but it should be noted that the area exposed by diminishing water levels is immediately subject to vegetation growth. The extent of this growth depends upon the amount of soil present.

5. During droughts of various intensities, what impact is anticipated upon recreational facilities (beaches, boat ramps, fishing piers and the like) and recreational usage of the reservoir?

Corps: Beaches, boat ramps and beaching areas, and fishing piers are designed to provide for recreational usage between the elevation of the 5-year flood pool and 6 feet below the elevation of the 10-year summer drawdown pool. The 10-year summer drawdown pool represents an event which would occur once in ten years. Ninety percent of the time the elevation of the lake during the summer would equal or exceed the 10-year summer drawdown pool.

Swimming beaches and boat beaching areas will be constructed as sand covered slopes and boat ramps of concrete within this drawdown zone. Floating fishing piers will be secured to devices along shore slopes which would permit adjustment to lake fluctuations. Total capacity for recreational usage and total annual visitation would not be significantly reduced during events up to the severity of the 10-year summer drawdown event. Total monthly recreational usage of the lake during the 10-year drawdown event would be reduced an estimated 20 percent. Although the more severe droughts would reduce seasonal recreation attendance, the resource would still sustain a significant recreational usage at the start of the season; the majority of the adverse impact occurs near the end of the recreation season due to increased drawdown caused by low flow augmentation needs.

Although available data show that recreationists are using large bodies of water despite large fluctuations in water surface, the value of a recreation day at this project has been reduced by 10 percent in recognition of fluctuating summer pool elevations.

Int: The recreational facilities of the Tocks Island Reservoir will be developed to efficiently operate in fluctuating water conditions. Recreation use could diminish as a result of a reduction in the surface water area. The aesthetic values would also depreciate. Boat ramps, fishing piers, and other facilities located at the water's edge and extending out into the water can be designed so that the adverse effects of varying water levels are minimized. We do not anticipate that this factor in itself will cause any serious decrease in fishing use—in fact, we have known of instances wherein extreme low-water conditions in a reservoir has been accompanied by a greater amount of fishing use, due to the real or imagined improvement of fishing success as a result of concentrating fish populations in a smaller area.

6. During periods of severe flooding, will the resultant enlargement of the lake pose any hazards to Matamoras, Pa., and Port Jervis, N.Y., and what steps are being taken to provide protection against such potential flood hazard?

Corps: As part of the reservoir project, a system of flood protection facilities will be constructed at Matamoras, Pa., and Port Jervis, N.Y. The system of levees and flood walls to be constructed along the banks of the Delaware and Neversink Rivers is being designed to provide for complete protection from the maximum lake elevation from flood control operations.

7. What impact will silting have upon the reservoir's storage capacity within 10 years, 20 years, 50 years? Is it planned to remove the silt periodically? If so, what impact will the removal operation have upon recreational use of the lake and for what periods?

Corps: The Delaware River and tributaries normally carry comparatively little sediment with the greatest load being carried during flood events. There are 19,000 acre-feet of reservoir-storage set aside for the purpose of containing sediment deposited within the lake over the 100-year period of analysis for the project. It is expected that sediment deposition would occur mainly in the upper reaches of the lake and its tributaries.

No plans are being made for periodic sediment removal. Since accumulation of sediment is not expected to be significant and no removal is anticipated, the recreational use of the reservoir is unaffected by sedimentation considerations.

8. What alternate flood protection facilities could accomplish the same degree of main stem protection and how do their costs compare with this project?

Corps: The least costly flood control alternative would involve construction of a dam on the main stem at Wallpack Bend at a cost estimated at almost twice that assignable to flood control at the Tocks Island Lake project. Studies of tributary streams indicate that a large number of tributary dams would have to be constructed to provide the same annual reduction in main stem flood damages. Their cost is conservatively estimated at three times the cost of flood control provided by the lake project. During formulation studies of the Delaware River Basin Plan, some 386 small flood control project sites were evaluated and 39 of the most economically attractive sites were recommended for adoption as part of the comprehensive plan. Development of these latter sites is proceeding under existing legislation, Public Laws 566 and '35, in accordance with desires of local interests.

9. What impact would alternate flood protection facilities conceivably have upon the environment of the River Basin, in comparison with the impact of this project?

Corps: The alternative flood control dam at Wallpack Bend would produce less of an adverse effect on the environment than would incorporation of flood control features at Tocks Island Lake. The effect on wildlife resources would be about the same as more valuable primary bottom lands would be affected. Flood control features at Tocks Island Lake primarily affect upland wildlife habitat. The 8-mile reach of the Flat Brook which would be used for flood control purposes with Tocks Island Lake would not be used for the alternative, thus preserving it in its existing state and thereby having less of an adverse impact on fishery resources. Deposition of stream sediment within the river reach upstream of the dam would be insignificant compared to that with flood control at Tocks Island Lake. The adverse effect on scenic, scientific and historic features would be significantly reduced through development at this alternative site, primarily from preservation of the Flat Brook, 9 miles of the Delaware and a greater portion of historic Old Mine Road in New Jersey. Construction of protective works at Port Jervis and at Matamoras which would be required with the lake project would not be required, thus eliminating the impact of these features on the environment.

The environmental and ecological impact related to tributary development of single purpose flood control projects would be less than that resulting from incorporating flood control at the Tocks Island Lake project.

10. Based upon Delaware River flood conditions of the past 50 years, what savings will flood protection at Tocks achieve along the main stem during the next 50 years?

Corps: Flood control storage at the lake project will permit full control of flood events up to the maximum flood experienced on the main stem during the past 132 years of basin records. The average annual flood control benefits which could be expected from project development would be \$2.5 mil-

lion at July 1970 price levels. Over a 50-year period, total project flood control benefits are estimated at \$125 million at July 1970 price levels.

#### PART 7—PUMPED STORAGE OPERATIONS

Official concerns about the preservation of Sunfish Pond near the site of a proposed pumped-storage power plant overlooking Tocks Island Dam and the need for additional power to service Delaware River Basin communities have been reported to four Congressmen who represent the tri-state Tocks region.

In the accompanying 17-page Information Report on Tocks Island Dam, the Federal Power Commission, the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Interior and the Delaware River Basin Commission comment on questions regarding power generation in the Tocks project.

Several of the agencies discuss steps being taken to carry out a Congressional mandate to preserve Sunfish Pond, a natural glacial lake on the Kittatinny Ridge in New Jersey, and to insure that its recreation and conservation values are not impaired, in this seventh of a series of Tocks reports issued jointly by Congressmen John G. Dow of N.Y., Joseph McDade and Fred B. Rooney of Pa., and Frank Thompson, Jr. of N.J.

According to the Federal Power Commission, the proposed project will help meet the power needs of 20 million residents of a 48,000 square mile area served by the PJM power pool. The PJM service area includes Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, Delaware and the District of Columbia—a region in which recurring power shortages have been experienced in recent years.

Impact of the power facility's operation upon fishlife in the Tocks Reservoir, as well as other related environmental considerations, are discussed by responsible agencies in the text of the report.

1. What is the status of planning for this power facility? What possibility exists that the pumped storage project will be blocked by action of the New Jersey Legislature or other developments? Within what time frame is the Federal Power Commission likely to file an environmental impact report with the Council on Environmental Quality and what review time is the Council likely to require for that report?

FPC: Public Law 91-282, approved June 19, 1970, authorized use of the head and water releases of Tocks Island reservoir as an incident to pumped storage hydroelectric power development subject to certain conditions, including the provisions of the Federal Power Act. No license application has been filed with the Federal Power Commission to date. It is understood that the applicant expects first to file an application with the Delaware River Basin Commission and that such an application will be filed in the near future. We have no information as to what actions the New Jersey Legislature or other entities might take to aid or block the pumped storage development.

Under FPC regulations, a license application, when filed with the Commission, must be accompanied by the applicant's detailed statement of the environmental factors specified in the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (PL 91-190). After review by the staff as to sufficiency and revision by the applicant, if necessary, the statement would be available to appropriate governmental bodies and copies sent to the Council on Environmental Quality. Following receipt of Federal agency comments on the proposed project, the FPC staff would prepare a draft environmental statement and furnish copies to CEQ and appropriate governmental agencies for comments. Each of them would be afforded 30 days in which to furnish comments. If the Commission grants an application, its final order would incorporate an environmental statement covering the required element of Section 102(2)(c) of the

National Environmental Policy Act. The entire procedure for processing the application could require from six months to a year. If a formal hearing is required, the time period would be substantially longer and the times by responses to draft environmental statements would be specified by the trial examiner.

Corps: Congress has passed enabling legislation which permits consideration of locating a pumped-storage power plant at the Tocks Island damsite. In accordance with that legislation the Corps of Engineers is proceeding with development and design in such manner as to provide for either installation of authorized conventional power or the pumped-storage development. We have no knowledge of the New Jersey Legislature's views or the FPC time frame.

DRBC: The New Jersey Electric Utilities' applications for Commission approval of the Kittatiny Mountain Project was amended to adapt the project plan to conform to the requirements of Public Law 91-282 and the Commission's Comprehensive Plan as amended by Resolution No. 68-12. The amended application was filed March 1971.

The project plan as described in the amendment now includes provisions made in accordance with specific environmental standards prescribed by Public Law 91-282 and Commission Resolution No. 68-12, including the following:

Sunfish Pond will not be used and its reaction and conservation values not impaired.

The existing Yards Creek Upper Reservoir on Kittatiny Mountain will be enlarged with minimum disruption of the natural environment.

The powerhouse, water conduits and transmission lines on the western slope and top of Kittatiny Mountain will be underground and invisible from the surface.

All excavation scars will be restored. All restorative landscaping will be provided.

Power operations will be within the limits of schedules relating to river management prepared by the Chief of Engineers and the Commission.

Applicant will provide and maintain fish protection facilities, if needed.

Due to the increasing public need for Kittatiny Mountain Project electricity, the applicants propose to install and operate two of the five pumped turbines and their related facilities first, as soon as possible; and to install the remaining facilities thereafter. Applicants are prepared to install the first two units for service in 1975.

This would require an apparent change of attitude by the State Senate leadership, which has prevented release of the Assembly-passed bill from committee. Such prospects are not known to the DRBC.

Add: The Federal Power Commission has advised it received unofficial word the three New Jersey utilities may file their application for a Federal license to operate the pumped storage facility by June 1st, 1971, but it has not received an official indication of timing from the utility applicants.

Also, it has been reported in the press that the New Jersey State Senate Committee has proposed a compromise to resolve proposals that New Jersey re-acquire the Sunfish Pond property previously conveyed to the utilities as a power plant site. The compromise does not require return of Sunfish Pond but would establish specific guidelines for its protection and preservation.

2. What specific role will this facility play in meeting the power needs of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York?

FPC: Power produced at the Tocks Island pumped storage development would be used in the peaks of the power loads. Thus, power would be generated during the hours of high power demand on weekdays by releasing water from the upper reservoir, either into the

Tocks Island reservoir or into the Delaware River below the dam. During night hours and on weekends, water would be pumped from the Tocks Island reservoir into the upper reservoir. The project would provide part of the supply for the applicant's utility system. The power would also be utilized by the Pennsylvania-New Jersey-Maryland (PJM) Interconnection which includes all major utilities in the States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia. The PJM systems serve an area of 48,000 square miles with a population of over 20 million. Some power is interchanged between PJM systems and utilities in adjoining States, particularly those in the State of New York.

The PJM Interconnection is in need of additional generating capacity to meet its power loads. Power shortages have been experienced in the last few years. As recently as February 1971, voltage reductions were instituted and appeals were made to large customers to reduce their use of electric power.

Pursuant to Commission order adopted in 1970, the various electric reliability councils report annually on their 10-year plans for constructing additional bulk power facilities. The Mid-Atlantic Area Coordination Group (MAAC), which is essentially the same as the PJM Interconnection, has reported plans for more than doubling its generating capacity during the 1970's. Steam-electric plants, both nuclear and fossil-fueled, gas turbine plants, and pumped storage capacity, would be added by the power systems. Thus, a mix of base-load and peaking capacity would be provided. The peak load of the MAAC systems is expected to increase from 25,737 megawatts in the summer of 1970 to 54,178 megawatts in the summer of 1979. To meet this projected load, a substantial amount of peaking capacity will be needed. The precise amount is not known at this time, but the range would be 8,000-10,000 megawatts.

DRBC: There is an increasingly critical need for additional electric system reliability

and supply in the densely populated areas in and around the Delaware Basin.

Applicants will provide a comprehensive pumped storage development to supply additional electricity during hours of peak public need in a highly reliable manner, and provide needed capacity with the capability of sustained output in the event of emergencies. The project will have an installed capacity of 1.3 million kilowatts and generate an average of 2.2 billion kilowatthours annually.

The scheduling of the pumping and generating operations will be governed by the power requirement of the Pa.-N.J.-Md. Interconnection, the large power pool of which the applicants are members. (Note: Power is interchanged between this pool and electric utility systems in the State of New York.)

3. Are there any other pumped storage, nuclear, or other power generating facilities contemplated or planned for development within the projected area? Elsewhere along the main stem? Would other power projects of any kind be considered by either the Delaware River Basin Commission or Federal Power Commission within or near the reservoir-park area?

FPC: As indicated in the answer to the previous question, the MAAC report shows a large amount of additional capacity planned for the region. None of this capacity is identified as within the Tocks Island area. The only pumped storage development specifically identified in the MAAC report is a 1,000-megawatt installation planned for completion in 1978 by the Potomac Electric Power Company at an undesignated site somewhere north of that Company's service area. Other than the proposed development at Tocks Island, we are unaware of any favorable pumped storage sites in the Delaware River Basin. However, there apparently are a number of favorable pumped storage sites in the Susquehanna River Basin.

The MAAC Group is planning the following capacity additions along the course of the Delaware River:

Name of plant	Year in service	Number of units	Total capacity, megawatts	Type plant	Approximate distance, from T.I site (miles)
Martin's Creek	(1) 1974, (2) 1975, (3) 1977	3	2,400	Fossil	10
Newbold	(1) 1975, (2) 1977	2	2,200	Nuclear	70
Salem	(1) 1972, (2) 1973	2	2,202	Nuclear	130
Deepwater	1977	2	160	Fossil	130
Edge Moor	1973	1	400	Fossil	130

Add: Since responding to this question, the DRBC has acted to require all utilities seeking to establish new power facilities or expand existing power facilities in the Delaware Basin within the next 15 years to report such plans to the Commission.

DRBC: To the knowledge of the Basin Commission, which must pass on such facilities under its project review authority, no other pumped storage project is proposed, planned, in discussion or otherwise under consideration in or near the National Recreation Area or Tocks Island Reservoir or upstream. In addition, the suggestion that one or more nuclear power stations are under consideration upstream of the Tocks Island Reservoir is total fiction. So is the reasoning connected to the suggestions—that a nuclear generator would be desirable to those favoring the Tocks Island Reservoir to prevent ice formations. The Basin Commission has polled each utility operating in the region as well as the Atomic Energy Commission with the identical result: No nuclear station is planned or proposed in the region.

Facilities tentatively scheduled for development, 1971 to 1980, elsewhere in the Basin, are: (1) 2000 Mw of nuclear capacity at Portland, Pa., (2) 2400 Mw of fossil capacity at Martins Creek, Pa., (3) 800 Mw fossil at

Eddystone, Pa., (4) 2200 Mw of nuclear capacity at Limerick, Pa., (5) 2200 Mw of nuclear capacity at Newbold Island (Delaware River near Burlington, N.J.) and (6) 2200 Mw of nuclear capacity at Salem, N.J. (Delaware Estuary).

The suggestion that the Basin Commission would entertain an application for another operation in the Water Gap National Recreation Area subsequent to its authorization by Congress is preposterous.

4. What impact will pumped storage operations have upon the reservoir level at various times during the course of a day, a week, a month, and a year?

FPC: Operation of the pumped storage development would not result in a seasonal drawdown of the Tocks Island Reservoir as could be the case if a conventional hydroelectric development were constructed. However, pumped storage operations will cause daily and weekly fluctuations in Tocks Island reservoir levels. The amount of such fluctuations will vary not only with the method of pumped storage operation but also with the elevation of the reservoir. The FPC does not have information on the detailed design and planned operation of the pumped storage development. It is our understanding, however, that the fluctuations during the recreation season would seldom exceed one foot.

Corps: Preliminary data indicate that pumped-storage operations should not adversely affect the weekly, monthly or yearly pool levels. Daily pool levels will vary depending on the peak power operations.

Int: The Corps of Engineers should answer this question, but from a recreation conservation point of view, if there is a pumped storage operation, it should return the water to the reservoir.

DRBC: The attached chart (not reproduced) shows the reservoir level diurnal fluctuations from maximum power generation that would result from pumped storage. The pumped storage drawdowns are superimposed on the larger fluctuations that will occur due to seasonal drawdowns for water supply and low-flow augmentation.

The diurnal fluctuations in the reservoir water level due to proposed pumped storage operations will vary from 0.8 feet (about 9 inches) at full pool to 3.8 feet at the maximum once-a-century seasonal drawdown.

5. Will water be returned to the reservoir or river from the pumped storage facility at a temperature higher than that of the reservoir or river? What temperature will be permitted by the DRBC or FPC for the returning water?

FPC: Water pumped from the Tocks Island reservoir into the upper reservoir and returned would be subject to certain heat gains due to machinery losses, solar and atmospheric radiation, and conduction, but also subject to heat losses due to back radiation, and evaporation. The net effect, however, would be negligible because the water would be retained in the upper reservoir for only a short time before it is returned to the lower reservoir. In the past, the FPC staff has considered the temperature effects of pumped storage operations to be insufficient to warrant recommendations with respect to designs or operating procedures in the interest of temperature control.

Corps: The only change anticipated would be caused by atmospheric conditions.

DRBC: Water will be returned to the reservoir or river from the pumped storage facilities at a temperature practically equal to that of the reservoir or river.

Normally water will be pumped into the upper reservoir during the night for use the following day. Only a very small amount of heat would be added in the process.

A temperature control bulkhead at the pump intake will be provided to permit selective withdrawal from various depths in the main reservoir.

In view of the negligible amount of heat added to the water in the pumped storage process, the Commission has not found it necessary to establish standards controlling heat rise as in the case of steam-electric generating plants.

6. What impact will the pumped storage operations have upon marine life and fish in the reservoir or below the dam? Can any practicable steps be taken to prevent fish being drawn into the power plant intake? Are such steps planned?

FPC: Pumped storage operations between an upper and a lower reservoir generally have little effect on the quality of the water in either reservoir. This includes the dissolved solids and gases such as oxygen, pH, and temperature. Pumped storage operations do cause the water surface of the lower reservoir to fluctuate, but if the fluctuations are kept small there should be little adverse effect on the spawning and habitats of the resident species of fish or on the productivity of fish food in the reservoir. This same answer applies to question 12, Fish and Wildlife.

With proper design of intake and discharge facilities and coordination of pumping cycles, the effect upon fish can be minimized although not entirely eliminated. Adult fish migrating upstream can be effectively

screened at the plant intake. With the downstream movement of anadromous fish such as the American shad moving past the intake of the powerhouse at the lower reservoir, some fish could be drawn through the turbines and into the upper reservoir if the migration occurred during the pumping cycle and if the fish were too small to be stopped by the intake screens. While some fish would probably be drawn through the turbines, the mortality rate of those fish would not be great if the turbines are properly designed.

By designing the pumped storage plant to discharge either into the Tocks Island reservoir or into the Delaware River below the dam, it would be possible to maintain desired continuous rates of flow downstream with no adverse effects on power and with benefits to the downstream fishery.

Int: The pumped-storage project could have some effect on the following:

1. Reservoir fluctuations
2. Reservoir stratification
3. Survival of resident and anadromous fishes within the reservoir
4. Temperatures, oxygen content, and fluctuation of water levels in the downstream reach
5. Attraction of anadromous fishes to fish passage facilities

Considering these items in the light of present knowledge, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife is of the opinion that reservoir fluctuations will normally not be of sufficient magnitude to affect adversely the abundance of fishes in the reservoir nor will effects on reservoir stratification be significant as regards fishery habitat.

In its presentation to the Water Resources Council in 1968 (a paper titled, "Hydroelectric Power at Tocks Island"), the Delaware River Basin Commission noted that "... The Service (Fish and Wildlife) concludes that operations of the proposed pumped storage feature would not materially improve or detract from the fish and wildlife resources provided necessary protective devices are installed and operated in a timely and efficient manner . . .". The Bureau is confident that practicable steps can be taken to prevent fish being drawn into the power plant. It is of the opinion that existing law (notably, the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act) gives assurance that such steps will be considered as planning advances. Installation of the necessary protective devices will be effected under paragraphs (3) (C) and (3) (D) of Resolution 68-12, adopted October 28, 1968, by the Delaware River Basin Commission, which provide that "the pumped-storage sponsor shall install and maintain at its own expense such special services and facilities as may be required to offset any deleterious effects which fishery studies now in progress may indicate with respect to fisheries of the river", and that "the project sponsor shall comply with such terms and conditions as may be imposed by the Federal Power Commission pursuant to the Federal Power Act or by the Delaware River Basin Commission pursuant to the Compact."

In its August 1965 report on fishery resources in relation to Tocks Island Dam and Reservoir, the Fish and Wildlife Service recommended:

- a. That temperature of waters released from the dam into Delaware River be within 8° F. of reservoir surface temperatures, and
- b. That dissolved oxygen content of release flows be at 5 mg/l or more.

Subsequently, in December 1967, the Delaware River Basin Commission issued "Basin Rules and Regulations—Water Quality". This established a temperature standard for the reach from Tocks Island to Easton not to exceed 5° F. rise above natural temperatures until stream temperature reaches 87° F., except in heat dissipation areas.

The standard adopted for dissolved oxygen in this reach was "not less than 4.0 mg/l

at any time." We presume that the operations of the pumped storage project will of necessity be such as to meet these standards.

An instantaneous minimum release of 1300 cfs downstream from Tocks Island Dam with maximum of 10,400 cfs was found to be acceptable to the Fish and Wildlife Service as expressed in a letter to the Philadelphia District Engineer September 15, 1968.

Discussions with the Corps of Engineers in the fall of 1968 led to agreement on a plan of operation which would, in all probability, prevent adverse effects upon seed oyster resources of Delaware Bay. The outcome of these discussions was summarized in a letter to the Philadelphia District Engineer dated November 25, 1968. It advised:

"1. That computer analyses of hypothetical operations for the period of water records confirmed that the project could be operated in accordance with the recommendation that inflow to Tocks Island Dam and Reservoir during the period April 1 through June 30, annually, be released, unregulated (except for control of flows in excess of channel capacity) without significant detriment to project purposes or benefits.

"2. That the project rule curve as contained in General Design memorandum dated April 1967 will be modified to reflect the above recommendation and project operations will be in accordance with it."

In view of this agreement, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior advised the Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Works, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, by letter dated December 26, 1968, that implementation of the foregoing would prevent damage to seed oyster resources of Delaware Bay. In the October 22, 1968 Resolution No. 68-12, Delaware River Basin Commission stated in paragraph (3) (B), "Pumping and generating operations shall be conducted within the limits of schedules jointly prepared by the Chief of Engineers and the Delaware River Basin Commission relating to the requirements of river management for the purposes of the Comprehensive Plan." We have no doubt that these schedules will reflect the operating criteria mentioned above, in which case the construction and operation of the proposed pumped-storage plant will have no significant effect upon flows in the Delaware River downstream as they relate to fishery resources.

DRBC: Fishery studies conducted over a 3-year period indicate that daily pumped storage operations will have no significant adverse effect on the fisheries of the reservoir.

The power facility structures will be constructed to permit fish to pass through them to and from the upper reservoir with a minimum of injury. Extensive research by the Corps of Engineers on the passage of fish through turbines of widely varying heads demonstrates that the ability of fish to pass successfully through hydraulic turbines is related to the clearance between the runner and the ends of the wicket gates. The Kittatinny Mountain machines will be designed to provide such adequate clearance.

Experience with pumped storage plants elsewhere indicates that fish passage through such plants is not uncommon and is generally successful.

An extensive investigation to determine the need for fish screens or other fish guiding or fish protective devices at the Muddy Run Pumped Storage Project resulted in the conclusion that there was no need for such protective facilities for the resident fisheries or other organisms present at the site.

Provision to prevent fish from being drawn into the plant intake can be made if found necessary.

The applicant is prepared to take steps to prevent fish from being drawn into the plant intake. However, such steps may not be found to be necessary.

Add: The Federal Power Commission has

advised it will ultimately decide whether the pumped storage facility's intake structure should be screened to prevent passage of fish to and through the generators. The Commission's rules and regulations require that the utilities report on potential impact upon fish. Further, the power plant application filed with the DRBC in March 1971, discusses the possibility of screening but considers it unnecessary because fish could pass through the generators unharmed.

7. What measures will the Delaware River Basin Commission and the Federal Power Commission require to protect Sunfish Pond, a natural glacial lake on Kittatinny Mountain near the power site?

FPC: The specific measures necessary to protect against impairment of ecological conditions at Sunfish Pond cannot be detailed at present. They would depend upon geological conditions and environmental studies. Any license granted would need to be designed to protect Sunfish Pond in the appropriate manner.

Int: An ad-hoc Task Force established by the Regional Coordinator, Northeast Region, Department of the Interior, has undertaken an investigation to identify former and present conditions in Sunfish Pond and establish acceptable ecological standards that must be maintained during construction and during the operation of the pumped storage facility. As soon as these standards are established they will be made known to the Delaware River Basin Commission and the Federal Power Commission.

DRBC: The pumped storage facilities are planned in such way as to preserve Sunfish Pond intact and not impair its recreation or conservation values. The westernmost point of the project upper reservoir is separated from the nearest point on Sunfish Pond by a little over a quarter of a mile, much of which is dense forest. Due to differences in elevation, and to forestation, the upper reservoir will be essentially indistinguishable from its surroundings when viewed from the vicinity of Sunfish Pond.

Sunfish Pond's water level and water quality will not be impaired by this construction, or by any seepage from the project upper reservoir. Occupancy of 17% of the Sunfish Pond drainage area by the project upper reservoir will not significantly affect Pond water levels. Study indicates this loss of drainage area would lower the Pond level only a few inches under the worst assumptions.

Seepage through the project upper reservoir embankment will be intercepted by a collecting ditch at the toe of the embankment to be pumped back into the upper reservoir and thus prevent the seepage from reaching Sunfish Pond.

8. To what degree has the natural state of Sunfish Pond been disrupted by the Yards Creek Reservoir and what steps are being taken or could be taken to prevent harm, or prevent further harm, to the glacial lake's natural state?

FPC: The licensee for the Yards Creek project was contacted and the following information was obtained:

(a) A small amount of seepage from Yards Creek upper reservoir does enter Sunfish Pond; however, it is believed that no adverse effect has resulted. The pH (acid-alkaline balance) of the water is unchanged.

(b) The Tocks Island upper reservoir would be located between the Yards Creek upper reservoir and Sunfish Pond and any seepage from the new reservoir that might enter Sunfish Pond would need to be prevented or controlled. A license could specify the design and control methods to be provided.

Conceivably appropriate measures applied in the design and construction of a new upper reservoir could correct any minor seepage now reaching Sunfish Pond.

Int: Sunfish Pond is relatively near to the Upper Yards Creek Reservoir; however, its full impact on the environment of the area has not been appraised. The ad hoc Task Force established by the Department is now in the process of reviewing the pumped storage aspects of the Tocks Island and related projects. If these studies show that harm has been done, modifications of operation or additional structural features of Yards Creek project will be recommended.

DRBC: Sunfish Pond has not been disrupted by Yards Creek reservoir in any way. No steps need be taken.

9. How does the cost of power to be generated by this facility compare with the costs of power which could be derived from alternate power facilities? Is there likely to be any consumer benefit derived from this power facility as opposed to any alternate?

FPC: This question can only be answered when an application for license has been studied in detail. One measure of the desirability of a proposed project is a comparison of its cost of producing power with the costs from available alternative power sources. Pumped storage developments have certain advantages in being capable of starting quickly and making rapid changes in the rate of power output that can result in economies and improved reliability of system operations. In commenting to the Corps of Engineers on the survey report that provided the basis for the authorization of the Tocks Island reservoir, the Commission, in its letter of January 18, 1962, expressed the opinion that pumped storage development at Tocks Island would be a desirable unit of the Delaware Basin Plan.

DRBC: It is estimated that applicant's plan would produce annual savings in cost of power of at least \$2 million to the region.

Congress, satisfied that the overall economic advantage of the project will be such as to supply a minimum annual payment of \$1 million by the applicant for the use of the Tocks Island Reservoir, has established a requirement to this effect. Public Law 91-282 requires that the applicant shall pay charges to the United States of not less than \$1 million annually for the use of Tocks Island Project.

The initial cost of certain additional features to be provided by the applicant to take the place of the originally authorized conventional power plant would be about \$7 million as opposed to \$27 million, at 1969 price levels, plus interest, based on the originally authorized plan.

The Senate and House Reports on Section 5 of Public Law 91-282 explain how net Federal expenditures for construction of the Tocks Island Project can be reduced by about \$76 million by means of the company proposal. However, following the writing of the reports, these savings are known to have advanced to at least \$80 million.

Also, in conformance with the requirements of Public Law 91-282, the applicants shall (a) furnish power free of charge for operation and maintenance of Tocks Island Dam and (b) furnish preference customers, at a special rate, the same amount of power and energy they would have received if the Government installed the conventional power plant.

Compared with the project, the construction, operation and maintenance of additional new alternative electric generation and transmission facilities, capable of providing equivalent power, would (a) consume a greater quantity of available land, water or related resources, (b) require a larger installation because of their inherently lower reliability, (c) provide power at greater cost and (d) present certain environmental constraints.

Electric power supply system reliability and other public benefits of the sort to be provided by applicant's development are es-

sential to the continuing health, welfare and long-term productivity of present and future generations in the large, densely populated, heavily industrialized region in and around the Delaware River Basin.

10. What alternate power sources could conceivably substitute for this facility and how do development costs compare?

FPC: The proposed pumped storage development would be used to provide peak power for system loads. Alternatives could include gas turbine capacity and oil-burning peaking steam-electric plants. The capital costs for such alternatives are generally comparable to those for pumped storage projects. The costs of power from the alternatives must include the costs of fuel. Pumped storage power costs to not include fuel costs but must include the cost of pumping energy. Meaningful comparisons cannot be made until further details are available on the design and costs of the pumped storage development.

Generally, alternative generating sources would have lower thermal efficiencies than sources which provide pumping energy for pumped storage operations. Thus, the impact on air quality of such alternatives might be greater than a properly planned pumped storage facility.

DRBC: An equivalent amount of additional electric power and energy could be provided and transmitted from additional new, alternative steam-electric generating plants burning coal, oil, natural gas or using nuclear fuel, located near or having available supplies of water, or by additional new gas turbine electric generating installations burning oil or natural gas.

Savings over the cheapest source of substitute power were estimated to be more than \$2 million annually.

Regarding the use of gas turbines, in spite of their low capital costs, the high energy production costs due to lower energy conversion efficiency, frequency of replacement, and considerably higher fuel cost make them uneconomical for the type of service to be provided by the pumped storage project.

The target of efficient operation of gas turbines is from 40 to 85 hours per month as opposed to the 142 hours per month full-load capability of the project.

#### PART 8—LOCAL IMPACT

The immediate and long-term impact of Tocks Island Dam and Delaware Gap National Recreation Area upon the tri-state Tocks region is assessed in this eighth of a series of information reports issued by the region's four Congressmen.

Responses from agencies representing local, state and national government interests in the Tocks project discuss the project's impact on local taxes, the region's expected economic development, and steps being taken to deal with environmental problems.

The Army Corps of Engineers, the Department of the Interior, Delaware River Basin Commission and the Tocks Island Regional Advisory Council provide responses to a series of questions raised by Congressman John G. Dow of N.Y., Joseph McDade and Fred B. Rooney of Pa., and Frank Thompson, Jr. of N.J.

1. What possibilities exist now to provide financial assistance "in lieu of taxes" or otherwise to local governments whose tax bases are being eroded by Federal property acquisitions?

Corps: There is no statutory authority for reimbursing local governments by the United States for losses of tax ratable properties. For the Lake project, authority exists to lease acquired improved properties to former owners or tenants on a year-to-year basis until required for project purposes. Seventy-five percent of the monies obtained in rental is paid to the State to be disbursed as the State Legislature may prescribe for the benefit of

public roads and public schools of the affected county or for public obligations for flood control or drainage improvement. Improved properties acquired for the Lake project which have been leased to former owners in fiscal year 1971 under this program provided nearly \$7,500 in rentals. Views of DRBC, NPS, and OMB should be obtained separately.

Int: The National Park Service has traditionally supported justified financial assistance "in lieu of taxes" for local governments. There is no existing means of doing this specifically in connection with the DWGNRA.

Tirac: Special Federal Assistance Program: Title I of P.L. 874 authorized financial assistance for maintenance and operation of schools to school districts on which activities of the Federal government have placed a financial burden. The act considers the following as financial burdens: (1) reduction of local revenues as a result of land acquisition which currently must be at least ten percent of the total assessment of real property, (2) education of children who reside on Federal property, and (3) sudden and substantial increases in school attendance as a direct result of the Federal projects.

Eligibility requirements for section 2 category, removal by acquisition by the Federal Government of 10 per cent or more of the assessed value of real property in the school district from the tax rolls since 1938, placing a substantial burden on such district not compensated for by other Federal payments made with respect to the property so acquired.

Rate of Federal payment for section 2 category, the amount that the school district would normally have received for current ex-

penditures from real property taxes if the property had not been acquired by the Federal Government (excluding any improvements made by the Federal Government), minus any other Federal payments made with respect to such property and available to the district for current operating expenses.

In actuality, repayment is not on a dollar for dollar basis, but is negotiated annually and is determined by the amount of "lost" taxes, demonstrated hardship to the school district, taxing efforts, and availability of funds for this Act.

P.L. 874 should be strengthened to provide full reimbursement to communities adversely affected by Federal acquisition—until such time as their ratables regain their pre-acquisition levels.

Other assistance: The only other extraordinary financial assistance that has been directed to the affected municipalities has been special allocations by the N.J. Legislature for school district purposes.

Some amounts of money from property rentals by the Corps have been made available, but practice of renting is now largely curtailed.

Municipalities affected: Recent statistics show that of the 21 local municipalities affected by Project land acquisition, only two municipalities in Monroe County, Pa., two in Sussex County, N.J., and one in Warren County, N.J., have experienced significant effects on their tax base. This can be attributed to the fact that, as of March 31, 1971, 3,945 properties containing 26,624 acres have been acquired or 36% of the total.

The following tables illustrate the effect Project property acquisition has had on the four municipalities to date:

TABLE I.—TAX LOSSES DUE TO ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY FOR TOCKS ISLAND PROJECTS, 1970

	Assessed value acquired property	Percent total assessed value	Tax loss (dollars)			
			Total	Township	School	County
Monroe County, Pa.:						
Middle Smithfield.....	\$555,410	9.0	38,323	2,222	29,437	6,665
Smithfield.....	405,700	7.1	26,776	406	21,502	4,868
Sussex County, N.J.:						
Sandyston.....	144,975	1.6	6,190	440	3,615	2,135
Walpack.....	4,786,713	40.9	147,242	3,410	95,740	48,093

TABLE II.—COMPARATIVE TAX DATA: 1967-70

	Year	Total assessed values (taxables)	Total rate <sup>1</sup>			
			Township	School	County	
Monroe County:						
Middle Smithfield.....	1967	\$1,190,300	68	8	49	
	1970	1,225,500	68	8	49	
	1971	1,238,650	(?)	8	(?)	
Smithfield.....	1967	5,219,375	62	4	47	
	1970	6,104,675	69	4	53	
	1971	6,332,825	(?)	4	(?)	
Sussex County:						
Sandyston.....	1967	\$13,063,098	24.24	4.09	11.22	
	1970	16,279,856	42.73	2.89	25.00	
	1971	17,014,355	46.21	2.51	25.08	
Walpack.....	1967	14,626,982	21.51	4.20	9.35	
	1970	9,583,920	31.67	.70	19.66	
	1971	10,157,892	43.83	.75	24.75	

<sup>1</sup> Rate expressed in mills. The total rates cannot be compared between counties because of the differences in assessment and taxing procedures.

<sup>2</sup> Not available.  
<sup>3</sup> 100 percent or equalized values.  
<sup>4</sup> Includes exceptions with local rates.  
<sup>5</sup> Includes library with county rates.

Pennsylvania municipalities: Even though the two municipalities on the Pennsylvania side lost substantial amounts of ratables, offsetting growth occurred so that tax rates did not appreciably rise. There does not appear to be adverse effects at this time because of property acquisition.

New Jersey municipalities: New Jersey municipalities are affected by five taxes, two each are county and local, while one is for schools. The county taxes are apportioned evenly per \$100 valuation throughout the

county. Other taxes vary by local conditions. Sandyston and Walpack property owners along with those in other district, had substantial increases in county and school taxes between 1967 and 1970.

Sandyston's share of the Sandyston-Walpack consolidated school system during the time period rose from 49% to 62% of the total budget. Their school tax levies rose 122%, compared to 29% for Walpack and 66% for all county districts. Sandyston residents have therefore carried an extra bur-

den above the county average due to acquisition activities in Walpack. This is despite the special assistance provided by State and Federal officials of \$104,781. The Sandyston-Walpack district is now considering merger with an adjacent district which would tend to share the impact of Federal acquisition. Local school authorities will have to re-assess their local financial situation as well as consider Federal assistance qualifications before authorizing such a merger.

Walpack eliminated its local taxes except for exemptions in 1970 and 1971, with its budget needs being met by various state payments for roads, tax rebates, etc. Some services (mostly related to roads) were cut to offset tax increases for other purposes. Sandyston has also decreased its local taxes in the past four years.

TABLE III.—COMPARATIVE TAX DATA: SUSSEX COUNTY, SANDYSTON AND WALPACK TOWNS, 1967-70

[Dollar amount in thousands]			
Year	Sussex County	Sandyston	Walpack
A. Total tax levies:			
1967.....	\$16,782	\$223	\$250
1970.....	\$26,439	\$393	\$225
Percent change.....	+58	+76	-16
B. School levies: <sup>1</sup>			
1967.....	\$9,975	\$103	\$109
1970.....	\$16,516	\$230	\$140
Percent change.....	+66	+122	+29
C. Equalized valuation (ratables at 100 percent value):			
1967.....	\$569,705	\$13,063	\$14,627
1970.....	\$697,597	\$16,280	\$9,584
Percent change.....	+22	+25	-35
D. 1967.....	(?)	\$37.8	\$48.9
1970.....	(?)	\$26.6	\$5.0
E. Effective total tax rates per \$100 valuation (at \$100 valuation): 1970..	\$3.89	2.46	2.37

<sup>1</sup> Sandyston-Walpack total, 1967, \$212; 1970, \$370; change 74 percent.  
<sup>2</sup> Not available.  
<sup>3</sup> Exemptions only, no local tax raised.  
<sup>4</sup> Average.

Table IV.—Extraordinary financial assistance authorized Sandyston-Walpack School District

Federal aid (Title I).....	\$24,781
State aid (emergency fund):	
1970-71.....	50,000
1969-70.....	30,000
Total to 1971.....	104,781

Pahaquarry Township: The municipality most affected is Pahaquarry Township, Warren County, which had only 9 unacquired properties remaining in it as of January 1, 1971. Complete acquisition of the Township—with the exception of one or two properties—is expected by the end of 1971.

Enough money is available or will be received this year so that no taxes will be levied to support either school or township budgets. The only financial problem that could arise is having enough cash reserve available at the time the county taxes of about \$6500 are due.

Evaluation: Determining the amount of undue tax burden caused by reduced ratables must be done on an annual basis by local and school authorities. State and Federal payments based on population, roads, etc., and lost ratables will vary significantly, depending upon the speed of acquisition.

As Walpack will be completely acquired its problems are transitional. Sandyston's will be longer lived, until property values rise to make up the ratables lost through Federal purchase. Certain townships in Pa. probably will also experience difficulties in the next few years similar to N.J. communities.

Special legislation should be enacted which would compensate municipalities for loss of ratables in those time periods when net losses occur in total ratables. This re-

imburement should be on a dollar for dollar basis so essential services are not cut for those residents remaining in the community during the acquisition period.

2. To what extent will the Corps or Park Service assist local government with highway maintenance, snow removal and similar services in areas where substantial numbers of properties are under Federal ownership? Is any assistance being provided now?

Corps: The Corps of Engineers has not provided nor does it have authority to provide financial assistance to local governments affected by Federal project developments for county highway maintenance programs.

Int: When land acquisition nears completion the National Park Service will develop and maintain its own internal road system to serve the area. In the interim, no assistance to local governments is being provided.

**TIRAC: Corps Policy:**

In response to an information request by TIRAC last year, the Corps stated that there is no authority for inclusion in Corps' Projects budget any local financial assistance to ease tax problems, maintain roads, or clear roads in winter time. Local township officials claim that no remuneration is made by the Corps when roads are taken over or used for Corps purposes. As a countering move, officials have drastically curtailed normal road maintenance or improvement programs, evidenced by Walpack Twp. not collecting any taxes this year for this purpose.

Some joint agreement should be made on this issue so that (1) the townships maintain reasonable services to remaining residents in affected areas, and (2) roads which are to be kept in use for the project are not allowed to deteriorate, resulting in unnecessary additional expense to the Project.

3. How have local governments been aided in other parts of the Nation during or after development of similar projects having substantial impact upon tax base and taxation levels?

Corps: The leasing program described in reply to question 1 above and Federal aid to impacted schools during construction are the only known programs by which the Federal government can provide direct financial aid to local governments so affected by this or other similar Federal project developments. In general, however, the affected tax base usually increases due to land enhancements related to recreation developments.

Int: At recently authorized Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, the state of Michigan has agreed to make payments to local governments in lieu of taxes. Grand Teton National Park is the only national park wherein special legislation provided payment in lieu of taxes. Authorization to make payment in lieu of taxes extends for a period of 20 years after lands are acquired. Funds for payment are derived from receipts at both Grand Teton and Yellowstone National Parks and average about \$20,000 per year.

4. What form of assistance, if any, does the Office of Management and Budget consider appropriate in such instances?

Corps: Deferred to Office of Management and Budget.

**OMB: (No response to this question)**

Add: Some relief in terms of Federal takeover of certain local responsibilities relating primarily to road maintenance could be accelerated if an accelerated program of property acquisition were supported both by Congress and by appropriate Executive Agencies. This will be examined in more detail in subsequent reports on Corps of Engineers and National Park Service funding.

5. What are current estimates of economic impact of the project upon the surrounding region in terms of population growth, housing and commercial development, and annual visitor spending? To what extent can

this economic impact be measured in terms of benefits to individual local governments, and in what respect?

Corps: The Basin population in 1970 was about 7 million and is expected to reach 11 million by the year 2000. The total permanent population of Monroe, Pike, Warren and Sussex counties was approximately 130,000 in 1950, 160,000 in 1960 and 200,000 in 1970; by the year 2000 it is expected to exceed 1/2 million. An in-depth study of the impact of the combined projects on these four counties was made by Robert R. Nathan Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C. for the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in 1966. Induced commercial development in the immediate area was estimated at 40 to 80 restaurants, 50 to 95 transient lodging establishments, 25 to 50 gasoline stations and 35 to 70 miscellaneous shops and service firms. About 1/3 of this development would occur in Pennsylvania and 2/3 in New Jersey. Visitors would spend an estimated \$28.5 million annually on food, lodging and miscellaneous goods and services. The tax base due to new construction would increase from \$20 million to \$40 million. Construction activities would create 1,000 new jobs, commercial operations up to 1,000 new jobs and during peak summer seasons almost 5,000 short term job opportunities would become available. Raymond and May Associates and the New Jersey Division of State and Regional Planning have also studied the same general impact area and predicted increases.

Int: To the best of our knowledge, no studies have been made since the Robert Nathan report "The Potential Impact of the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area on its Surrounding Communities," dated 1966. This report made the estimates listed below:

- a. visitor expenditures—\$28,500,000 annually
- b. tax base increase due to new construction—\$20-\$40,000,000
- c. employment—500-1,000 new year-round jobs
- d. commercial facilities—\$44.7 million investment by 1980.

**TIRAC: 1965 Economic Impact Study:**

An economic impact study (Nathan Report), sponsored by the States of New Jersey and Pennsylvania in 1965, demonstrated that the Tocks Island area would be urbanized within 25 years. By that time, permanent population could triple and summer residents and visitors, without the National Recreation Area would double.

**TABLE I.—POPULATION PROJECTIONS FOR THE TOCKS ISLAND IMPACT AREA, 1970-90 (MONROE, PIKE COUNTIES, PA.; AND SUSSEX, WARREN COUNTIES, N.J.)**

[Figures are in thousands]

	Permanent population	Summer population	Peak population
<b>Pennsylvania:</b>			
1970.....	56	105-120	161-175
1990.....	100-120	200-250	300-375
<b>New Jersey:</b>			
1970.....	150	50-60	200-210
1990.....	340-445	100-120	440-565

This would take place *without* construction of the projects, due to the area's:

**Geographic position**—on the fringe of the expanding New York-Philadelphia megalopolis.

**Highway system**—Three interstate roads and others now under construction bring the region within one hour of New York City and less than two from Philadelphia. They also tie into New England, Washington and mid-Western systems.

**Recreation orientation**—Long known for its natural beauty, and as a vacation land, recreation and second home growth has

moved even more rapidly than permanent population.

Visitor Expenditures: The original estimate of annual visitor expenditure was \$28.5 million. In reviewing this figure we have adjusted for the following factors—

- (1) Rise in price levels, (2) changes in park master plan to exclude family camping and expand winter uses, (3) increased leisure time and real family income.

We have, however, remained strictly with expenditures by persons coming to the area primarily for the park's recreation facilities. The current expenditures estimate ranges between \$48 million and \$55 million annually.

Investment in Related Commercial Facilities: The 1965 impact study project that, within the ten year period spanning the federal projects construction, \$20.6 million to \$44.7 million would be invested in commercial facilities aimed primarily at satisfying park visitor demands. Revising this figure to allow for adjustments noted above, this type of investment is estimated at \$40 million to \$80 million for the same period. The higher limit would seem to be more realistic as shown by the \$20 million now being spent by Playboy, Inc. for a major hotel-resort complex in Sussex County.

Allocating these totals in the same ratio as the visitation pattern, 60 percent would be invested in New Jersey and 40 percent in Pennsylvania.

(The total cost of the projects has not been included here, however, employees wages are counted in the next section).

Employment Impact: Wages of employees in construction and operation of project related facilities will also make an important contribution to the economic well-being of the area. This may be tabulated as follows:

**TABLE II.—ESTIMATED ANNUAL EMPLOYMENT IN CONSTRUCTION**

Project	Number of persons (per year)	Time period (years)
Tocks Dam and Park.....	700 to 800	8
Area highways.....	200 to 300	8
Commercial facilities.....	70 to 150	10
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>970 to 1,250</b>	

Wages for persons working in construction during the 8 year period would total \$90 million at 1970 wage rates, or \$8 million to \$10 million per year.

Employment at the commercial facilities would add 3000 more jobs per year which, at minimum wages, would add an additional \$12 million annually to the local economy.

Expected Direct Impact: Although total construction costs of the dam, park, and highways has been excluded from this analysis, the economic impact of the factors listed is seen to be of significant proportions. Direct visitor expenditures alone, in a ten year period, will bring over \$500 million into the region, more than twice the cost of the Tocks Dam. This shows on the table following:

**TABLE III.—EXPECTED DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE TOCKS PROJECTS**

[Millions of dollars]

Type of expenditure	Annual	10-year period
Visitor expenditures.....	\$48 to \$55.....	\$48 to \$550.
Investment in commercial facilities.....	\$5 to \$10.....	\$40 to \$80.
Employment wages:		
Project construction.....	\$8 to \$10.....	\$80 to \$100.
Commercial facilities.....	\$6 to \$12.....	\$60 to \$120.
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>\$67 to \$87.....</b>	<b>\$660 to \$850.</b>

(Indirect benefits, through the "multiplier" effect have not been calculated, but

it is clear that the total ramifications would be considerably more than shown here.)

5 (b). To what extent can this economic impact be measured in terms of benefits to individual local governments, and in what respect?

#### Local tax base

Due to the wide variability in assessment procedures and property tax rates, it is not possible to state the amount of additional taxation which will be available to local governments. However, using the \$80 million commercial investment figure, the adjacent New Jersey townships could add \$48 million to their tax base, while the similarly situated Pennsylvania communities could add \$32 million.

Other taxes, such as the occupation and wage taxes now imposed would also add to local treasuries.

Land values which have already risen sharply, can be expected to continue in this trend, due partially to the projects but primarily to vacation home construction. This increased local tax income has curtailed tax rates increases, best demonstrated by rates in Monroe County shown in Table II under Question No. 1.

6. What steps are being taken to prevent pollution of the project area which might result from growth projected for the region and the anticipated influx of tourists? How will the cost of these programs be shared by local, state and Federal governments?

Corps: A land and water use management program will guide recreational development and preservation of natural resources, e.g., scenic, scientific, historic, within the project boundary. This program is designed to control the visitor's impact upon the project environment. The program provides for controlling impact on more fragile resources within the area by making them available only to educational and scientific groups. Sturdier resources will be developed to sustain what is considered to be a non-harmful visitor load. Initial water-related recreational facility development at the project utilizes less than 1/2 of the evaluated water-related recreational capacity of the resource. Experience gained from visitation to initial developments would be used in guiding future development of the remaining resource potential for recreation and in furtherance of controlling the visitors' impact upon natural area resources. Power boat usage of the lake will be limited to that level which can be safely supported without harm to public health and to the lake ecology. Sewage treatment, solid waste and vector control programs for the reservoir project will be developed to maintain a high quality environment in accordance with applicable public health standards. Costs of the various programs for the project will be borne by the Federal Government.

Enforcement of basin water quality standards adopted by the Delaware River Basin Commission within the portion of the drainage basin controlled by the dam should provide maintenance of the existing high water quality of stream flows which would be entering Tocks Island Lake. The Commission and the Tocks Island Regional Advisory Council have completed studies of liquid and solid waste management programs, respectively, for the 1,000 square mile six county area within the immediate project influence zone. Means of implementing these programs will be developed.

Int: The costs of pollution control for Federal projects within the DWGNRA have been incorporated into the development ceiling. The National Park Service is cooperating with the Tocks Island Regional Environmental Study being made by the Delaware River Basin Commission.

DRBC: *Preventive steps.* The DRBC and the pollution control agencies of the States

of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, all have active programs of identifying and correcting sources of pollution in the Tocks Island region. The DRBC, in cooperation with Federal, State, and regional agencies, has recently completed a study of the liquid-waste disposal problem, as projected for the next 50 years, in the six-county, three-State region surrounding the Tocks Island Reservoir. The purpose of this study was to define the problem and outline alternative plans for liquid-waste disposal.

The alternative sewerage schemes for the region range in their degree of regionalization from no regionalization—calling for about 120 small treatment works serving local communities—to the maximum possible degree of regionalization—with a system of trunk sewers conveying liquid wastes from sources throughout the region to a single waste-water treatment plant to be located on the Delaware River downstream of Tocks Island Dam.

No decision has been made yet among the alternative sewerage plans. The DRBC is continuing studies of the alternatives to determine the optimum choice with respect to protection of the environment, administrative efficiency, and financial feasibility. The Maxwell School of Public Administration, Syracuse University, is currently conducting a study for the DRBC of the institutional and financial problems related to handling the waste-water collection and disposal problem for the interstate region.

Water quality standards have been established for the entire Delaware River Basin, and all new waste discharges in the Tocks Island region resulting from projected growth of resident and visitor population in the region will be required to meet these standards. The criteria used for design and review of waste treatment works proposed for the region include the DRBC water quality standards. Through the Commission's normal review process, as required under section 3.8 of the Delaware River Basin Compact, the DRBC can be sure that all waste treatment plants built to serve the region are designed to meet the water quality standards.

It has been inferred by some persons that the sewerage problem in the Tocks Island region and related costs can be attributed solely to the building of the dam and reservoir. This inference is false. The problem already exists and will grow whether the reservoir is constructed or not. The growth projected for the region, including visitors outside the National Recreation Area, is from a 1970 peak-season daily population of 193,000 to a 2020 peak-season daily population of 926,000. After full development as planned, the National Recreation Area is expected to handle a maximum of about 142,000 visitors on any given day during the peak summer season. Thus, it can be seen that of the total peak-season population of 1,068,000 in the year 2020, only 142,000—about 13 percent—will be attributable to the National Recreation Area and the Tocks Island Reservoir. Of the 142,000 visitors to the two Federal projects, probably as many as 100,000 will be there because of the attraction of the large man-made lake. Thus, it is fair to say that about 100,000 visitors, out of a total peak-season population of 1,068,000 in 2020, will be attributable to the existence of Tocks Island Reservoir.

In terms of quantities of waste water, the proportion attributable to visitors to the Recreation Area and Reservoir is even less. Out of a daily total of 98.7 millions of gallons of waste waters projected for the six-county Tocks Island region for a peak-summer day in the year 2020, only 5.7 millions of gallons will be from visitor areas within the Recreation Area. The other 93 millions of gallons will come from sources outside the Recreation Area. Thus, less than six percent of the total 2020 waste-water volume for the

region can be attributed to the visitors to the two Federal projects.

Cost sharing. The sharing of costs for pollution prevention in the Tocks Island region is not expected to be very different from cost sharing elsewhere in the Delaware River Basin and throughout the nation. The users of the sewerage system or systems will be expected to contribute to the costs of construction, operation, and maintenance. Communities hooking up to a regional system—if a regional system is built—could be expected to pay for the service provided. These communities, in turn, would assess charges against residents and commercial and industrial users of the community sewerage system; these charges would cover the capital and operating costs of both intracommunity and extracommunity sewerage facilities. The commercial enterprises serving tourists and other visitors to the region would probably be assessed charges adequate to cover the incremental costs of collecting, conveying, and treating the proportional waste-water volumes attributable to the region's visitors. The methods of assessing charges for visitor-serving commercial enterprises would probably vary among the many local jurisdictions of the region, in whose hands this responsibility rests.

Both the Federal Government and the State governments concerned in the Tocks Island region have enacted laws providing grants in aid to communities for construction or operation of sewerage works, or both. Thus, all levels of government will share in the costs of pollution control in the region.

If a regional system is undertaken to handle the liquid-waste disposal problem for part or all of the Tocks Island region, the authority responsible for such system would undoubtedly avail itself of any grants-in-aid applicable under State and Federal laws.

In the event that no regional sewerage system is created that can reasonably serve part or all of the National Recreation Area, the Recreation Area will have to handle its own liquid-waste disposal problems. The financing methods generally employed by the National Park Service for sewerage of its facilities would probably be followed in this case. In any event, the Federal government would be expected to provide, at Federal expense, facilities adequate to handle the liquid-waste load from all visitor centers in the Recreation Area.

If a regional system is provided that can reasonably serve all or part of the National Recreation Area, it is expected that the Recreation Area will hook up to the system and pay a share of the costs of the regional conveyance and treatment system.

Presumably, the charges levied on visitors to the National Recreation Area would be adequate to cover the Federal Government's costs of providing all services, including sewerage.

#### PART 9—PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

An eight-year construction schedule for Tocks Island Dam could be reduced to six years and substantial savings could be realized in land acquisition and construction costs if project funding is accelerated, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior have reported to four Congressmen representing the tri-state Tocks region.

In this ninth in a series of Information Reports issued jointly by the Congressmen, the Corps and the Department of the Interior, discuss the impact that past funding limitations have had on the dam and the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area projects.

Because costs estimates for the park portion of the project are currently being updated, complete timetables and appropriation needs for that portion of the project are not yet available, Interior reported to Congressmen John G. Dow of N.Y., Joseph Mc-

Dade and Fred B. Rooney of Pa., and Frank Thompson, Jr., of N.J., who compiled the reports.

The report also indicates that \$3.6 million, a sum equal to the amount by which Congress last year increased the fiscal 1971 Tocks Island Dam appropriation to acquire properties classified as "hardship cases," still is frozen and is not expected to be released until after the start of fiscal year 1972 on July 1, 1971.

1. What is the current timetable, in detail, for property acquisition, design, and construction of all features of the Corps project? Include annual levels of funding necessary.

Corps: A summary of the current land acquisition, design and construction schedules follows:

(Thousands of dollars at July 1970 price levels)

Land acquisition:	Costs
Fiscal year 1972	\$7,000
Fiscal year 1973	14,600
Fiscal year 1974	10,700
Fiscal year 1975	10,807
Fiscal year 1976	8,000
Fiscal year 1977	3,665
<b>Total</b>	<b>54,772</b>

Engineering and design:	Costs
Fiscal year 1972	\$1,000
Fiscal year 1973	1,000
Fiscal year 1974	1,000
Fiscal year 1975	1,000
Fiscal year 1976	500
Fiscal year 1977	500
Fiscal year 1978	242
Fiscal year 1979	200
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,442</b>

Construction*:	Costs
Fiscal year 1972	\$4,150
Fiscal year 1973	8,340
Fiscal year 1974	25,770
Fiscal year 1975	39,400
Fiscal year 1976	42,900
Fiscal year 1977	31,100
Fiscal year 1978	20,850
Fiscal year 1979	4,950
<b>Total</b>	<b>177,460</b>

\*Includes Cost of Supervision and Administration.

Detailed information on the current project construction schedule follows:

*Construction schedule*

(Thousands of dollars at July 1970 price levels)

Fiscal year 1972:	Estimated costs
Relocate power line at dam site	\$150
Continue foundation preparation	3,500
Temporary fish passage	50
Supervision and administration	450
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,150</b>

Fiscal year 1973:	
Start relocation of U.S. 209	\$650
Complete foundation preparation	4,400
Start Stage I excavation and embankment	2,100
Supervision and administration	1,190
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,340</b>

Fiscal year 1974:	
Continue relocation of U.S. 209	3,770
Relocation of utilities	1,645
Start reservoir clearing	3,300
Continue Stage I excavation and embankment	3,300
Start tunnel and outlet works	8,800
Fish and wildlife facilities	300
Start power plant	200
Start levees and flood walls	3,260

Supervision and administration	1,195
<b>Total</b>	<b>25,770</b>

Fiscal year 1975:	
Continue relocation of U.S. 209	6,400
Complete utilities relocations	4,490
Complete reservoir clearing	4,400
Complete Stage I excavation and embankment	700
Continue tunnel and outlet works	\$6,000
Continue fish and wildlife facilities	1,700
Continue power plant	1,900
Continue levees and floodwalls	6,640
Start pumping plants	1,500
Start recreation facilities	3,700
Bank stabilization	340
Start ordering permanent operating equipment	150
Supervision and administration	1,480
<b>Total</b>	<b>39,400</b>

Fiscal year 1976:	
Continue relocation U.S. 209	6,400
Complete tunnel and outlet works	7,000
Start remainder of work on dam	11,000
Complete fish and wildlife facilities	2,950
Continue power plant	4,650
Access roads	250
Continue local protection	2,300
Continue recreation facilities	4,670
Building, grounds, and utilities	370
Complete ordering permanent operating equipment	210
Supervision and administration	1,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>42,900</b>

Fiscal year 1977:	
Complete relocation of U.S. 209	3,650
Start relocation of other roads	2,300
Continue remainder of work on dam	11,000
Continue power plant	4,650
Complete local protection	2,300
Complete pumping plant	1,600
Continue recreation facilities	4,650
Supervision and administration	900
<b>Total</b>	<b>31,100</b>

Fiscal year 1978:	
Continue remainder of work on dam	11,000
Continue power plant	4,650
Complete recreation facilities	4,650
Supervision and administration	550
<b>Total</b>	<b>20,850</b>

Fiscal year 1979:	
Complete power plant	4,650
Supervision and administration	300
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,950</b>

2. What is the current timetable, in detail, for property acquisition, design and construction of all features of the Park project? Include annual levels of funding necessary.

Int: Property acquisition timetables are generally a matter of concern to the Corps of Engineers. Design and construction of recreation facilities are programmed to be virtually completed by 1980, the assumed completion date of the reservoir. Facilities that can be functional independent of the reservoir are being designed and programmed for construction as land is acquired. In FY '72 \$867,000 are programmed for construction of recreation facilities by the National Park Service in DWGNRA. The five-year construction program consists of the following: FY '73: \$2.2 million; FY '74: \$5 million; FY '75: \$4.4 million; FY '76: \$1.4 million; FY '77: \$1.8 million. This totals, including all expenditures to the end of FY '77: \$16.4 million. These figures are reflective of the \$18.2 million ceiling but do not consider escalation.

Add: Costs associated with the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area are currently being updated by consultants engaged by the Corps of Engineers. Sufficient detail is not available at this time to develop complete answers to this question. It has been estimated a more complete cost picture may be available sometime in June, 1971.

3. If annual funding levels were increased to maximum amounts which can be utilized by the Corps and Park Service, what impact would this have on current timetables?

Corps: By increasing annual funding to the maximum which can be utilized, the present eight construction season schedule for the Corps of Engineers portion of the Tocks Island Lake project can be reduced by two seasons. Information on the impact on the timetable of the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Areas is deferred to the National Park Service.

Int: Assuming that land acquisition can be and would be speeded up so that development sites were available, the net effect would be savings in terms of escaping the effect of escalating acquisition and construction costs. The amount of these savings would be substantial but difficult to estimate.

4. What funding levels were requested by the Philadelphia District of the Corps, by the Corps of Engineers central office, by the Bureau of the Budget, and granted by Congress each year since funding of the project was initiated? What portions of each fiscal year appropriation was frozen for any period of time, and the duration of each freeze?

Information on funding levels for the reservoir project since Fiscal Year 1964 is as follows:

FUNDING LEVELS

[In thousands of dollars]

Fiscal year	Philadelphia district	OCE	OMB	Congress	Weekly allowance
1964	240	250	250	250	240
1965	450	450	450	450	1,985
1966	700	600	1,000	1,000	2,040
1967	975	975	975	975	1,225
1968	5,650	3,000	4,000	4,000	3,800
1969	9,200	5,000	4,000	3,880	2,050
1970	5,700	4,000	4,000	4,000	3,500
1971	12,000	8,300	8,250	11,850	11,850

1 Includes \$390,000 allotted by Second Supplemental Appropriation, fiscal year 1965, and \$145,000 transferred from other projects.  
 2 Includes \$40,000 transferred from other projects.  
 3 Additional was requested for continuation of planning.  
 4 Reduction of \$1,830,000 reflects deferral of land acquisition under administration program for curtailment of fiscal year 1969 expenditures and share of overall reduction for congressional underfinancing.  
 5 Reduced for savings and slippage.  
 6 \$3,600,000 placed in budgetary reserve for allotment in fiscal year 1972.

5. What funding levels were requested by the Northeast Region of the Park Service, by the Park Service Central office, by the Office of Management and Budget and granted by Congress each year since the park project was initiated? What portion of each fiscal year appropriation was frozen for any period of time and the duration of that freeze?

Int: Land acquisition funding levels requested by the Northeast Region were based on data prepared by the Corps of Engineers and construction levels are as follows:

Fiscal year	NER request	WASO request	Congressional grant
1967	\$383,800	\$383,000	\$383,800
1968	1,500,000	1,350,000	489,500
1969	1,500,000	537,300	518,300
1970	1,300,000	528,000	528,000
1971	1,300,000	600,000	600,000

Note: Land acquisition funding for the park portion of the project is supplemented on the basis of information from the Department of the Interior.

Fiscal year	WASO	Congress	Adjusted	Net <sup>1</sup>
1966	\$250,000	250,000		250,000
1967	4,000,000	6,339,500	\$-2,000,000	4,339,500
1968	11,000,000	9,500,000	\$-321,000	9,179,000
1969	5,500,000	4,000,000	\$-129,900	3,870,100
1970	2,561,000	4,561,000	\$54,713	4,506,287
1971	13,860,457	14,660,457		14,660,457
1972	606,656	(?)		606,656
Total				39,412,000

<sup>1</sup> Net total, including request—1972.

<sup>2</sup> 250,000 reprogrammed from other projects.

<sup>3</sup> At that time appropriations depended upon receipts, \$2,000,000 cut out because receipts did not equal payments.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Pay increase for B.O.R.—funds for increase to come from that agency \$44,900. Reprogramming of \$85,000 for North Cascades project.

<sup>6</sup> \$35,370 lost because it was not obligated to the project in a 1 year period. \$19,343 reprogrammed to Padre Island projects.

<sup>7</sup> Pending before Congress. Official of Park Service, Renaldi, sure of appropriation.

#### PART 10—RESERVOIR COSTS

Construction of the Tocks Island Dam and Reservoir, exclusive of the park portion of the project, is expected to cost a total of \$370,000,000 through completion, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has reported to four Congressmen representing the tri-state Tocks region.

In response to a question posed by the Congressmen, the Corps also reported that the Federal government could have fully 25 percent of the cost to acquire remaining land for the dam and park portions of the project if a "crash" land acquisition program were authorized. The total cost has not yet been determined precisely, but it is likely to approximate \$100 million, of which \$25 million represents the potential savings.

The Congressmen reported they have asked the Office of Management and Budget to consider the feasibility of an 18-month program to acquire all of the remaining privately-owned property within the 72,000 acre project site.

It is estimated such a crash program might save \$25 million in land costs and substantially reduce hardships experienced by private property owner and local governments as the result of the slower-paced land acquisition program currently being followed.

In this 10th in a series of Information Reports on Tocks Island Dam issued by Congressmen John G. Dow of N.Y., Joseph McDad and Fred B. Rooney of Pa., and Frank Thompson Jr. of N.J., the Corps also reports that \$3.6 million in additional funds appropriated by Congress to acquire properties classified as "hardship cases" still is frozen

and is not expected to be released until after July 1, the start of Fiscal Year 1972.

A. Tocks Island Dam and Reservoir, \$259,000,000 (February 1971 estimate).

1. What is a reasonable estimate of probable cost increases to be experienced during the remaining development period, that is to 1979 or 1980? Is \$100,000,000 in additional costs a reasonable estimate of the probable increase, assuming there will be substantial increases during the next three or four years until some of the major contracts have been awarded, with declining increases during the latter part of the development period as the project advances toward completion?

Corps: Based on the current proposed construction schedule and applying the average annual escalation factors experienced between 1960 and 1970 for lands and damages, engineering and design, and construction, a reasonable estimate of total project cost escalation would be \$110 million.

Add: Thus, to completion, the total cost of the reservoir portion of the project, including site acquisition, design, and construction is likely to reach \$370,000,000.

2. When will the \$3.6 million in fiscal 1971 funds for acquisition of "hardship" properties, currently frozen by the Administration, be released to the Corps?

Corps: Release is anticipated in early July, 1971.

3. Based on current estimates, how much additional money must be appropriated to enable the Corps to complete property acquisition?

Corps: After FY 1971, at July, 1970, price levels, approximately \$54.8 million in funds would be required to complete acquisition of property for the Tocks Island Lake project.

Add: The sum of \$54.8 million, based on July, 1970, cost levels, is the estimate cost to acquire only the remaining privately-owned properties within the Corps portion of the project. Park costs will be treated separately in Section M to be issued later.

4. If you had all of the property acquisition money in your hands now, and you moved ahead with a crash program of property acquisition to acquire all of it within the next 12 to 18 months—assuming you could gear up to do so—how many millions of dollars could be saved by averting further property value escalation likely to occur if land acquisition is spread over the next four or five years?

Corps: Approximately \$13 million would be saved through implementation of an 18 month property acquisition program for the reservoir project.

Add: The potential savings to acquire the remaining reservoir project site through a crash acquisition program is equal to 25 percent of total remaining cost of \$54.8 million. It is assumed that a 25 percent savings would be realized also if a crash acquisition program encompassed still-to-be-acquired park property, as well.

In view of this, the four Congressmen have urged the Office of Management and Budget to weigh the potential cost savings and consider the feasibility of an 18-month land acquisition program funded in fiscal years 1972 and 1973. OMB was asked to consider priority funding for site acquisition because the Tocks project area is situated in the high-density Megalopolis population corridor.

During the second Inter-Agency Conference on Tocks April 6, 1971, representatives of the Corps and Interior agreed that accelerated property acquisition could substantially reduce the project's impact upon private property owners and local governments.

5. What is the current Administration attitude toward enactment of legislation to

authorize the Delaware River Basin Commission to issue bonds to make the necessary land acquisition money immediately available to carry out a crash program of land acquisition? That is, with assurance the DRBC bonds would be retired on a regular schedule with certain regular and consistent appropriations for that purpose?

OMB: In reference to your suggestion of authorizing the Delaware River Basin Commission to issue bonds to secure the necessary funds for land acquisition, I understand you have introduced proposed legislation for this authorization. I am sorry to report that I must defer making comments on this proposal until this Office has received the reviews of the appropriate Federal agencies. At any rate, I believe we should do what we can within the limits of sound management and budget policy to hold down costs of Federal projects. [Extracted from a letter April 9, 1971, signed by Honorable Caspar W. Weinberger.]

6. Without regard to any budget limitations placed upon it for any reason, how much money could the Corps of Engineers use in fiscal 1972 to advance the Tocks project with reasonable speed and to minimize further cost escalation?

Corps: Based on current manpower levels, a total of \$14.25 million, an additional \$2.1 million over the FY '72 request, could be used in FY 1972 to advance completion of the project.

Add: The Office of Management and Budget has requested an appropriation of \$8,550,000 for the Corps' portion of the Tocks project for fiscal 1972. That sum, plus \$3.6 million appropriated in fiscal 1971 but not yet released by OMB, plus the \$2.1 million in additional funds cited in the Corps' response above, total the \$14.25 million which the Corps indicates it could use in fiscal 1972. The total does not include the sum necessary if an accelerated land acquisition program were to be initiated.

7. Will the Office of Management and Budget support the necessary increases of the Tocks Island project's budget figure for fiscal 1972 to help speed the project to completion, reduce the uncertainties which now confront citizens and communities of the Congressional Districts directly involved, and to avert further cost escalation to the greatest extent possible?

OMB: You also asked for our comments on emergency funding for an accelerated program of land acquisition. The hardships on property owners you described were instrumental in arriving at the decision made in 1969 to begin acquiring land in advance of construction of the project.

As you know, funds have been appropriated at a relatively steady rate to permit timely purchase of lands for the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. The amount included in the 1972 budget for the Land and Water Conservation Fund will exhaust the \$37.4 million appropriation area. [Extracted from a letter, April 9, 1971, signed by Honorable Caspar W. Weinberger.]

8. What impact will the Urban Relocation Act of 1970 have on Tocks Island property acquisition? What benefits does it offer project area property owners? Will any of its benefits apply retroactively to former owners of properties already acquired?

Corps: It is not anticipated that there will be any adverse effects in property acquisition under Public Law 91-646.

The new act will reimburse property owners for costs of prorated share of property taxes, transfer taxes, and pre-payment fees, costs which were not covered under previous acquisition policies. Benefits to property owners and tenants in acquiring a replacement site are much greater than those provided under the former Resettlement Act.

These added benefits accrue in categories of replacement housing for former owners and tenants, relocation assistance, advisory service and costs of moving.

Former owners, whose properties were acquired and who have not moved prior to January 2, 1971, will be covered under the new act.

#### PART 11—PARK COSTS

Discussion of the impact of inflation on development of the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area and efforts to resolve differences between Corps of Engineers and National Park Service plans for water-based recreational facilities is contained in this final Information Report on Tocks Island Dam issued by four Congressmen representing the tri-state Tocks region.

According to comments supplied by the Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior (including the National Park Service) an accurate cost picture for the park portion of the project cannot be developed until sometime in June.

Congressmen John G. Dow of N.Y., Joseph McDade and Fred B. Rooney of Pa., and Frank Thompson Jr. of N.J., were advised by the two Federal agencies with primary responsibility for development of the Tocks project that cost figures relating to the park portion of the project are being updated at the present time.

The report does indicate, however, that \$18,200,000 worth of recreational facilities originally proposed for development within the park portion of the project have escalated to \$46.3 million, based on 1970 cost levels (Page 114).

In addition, the Corps of Engineers reports that the second stage of proposed water-based recreational facilities, tentatively planned for development during the 1980 and 1990 period and capable of increasing the park's capacity from about 5 million annual visitor days to about 10.5 million, would cost an additional \$21.5 million at 1970 cost levels, up from \$17 million based on 1968 price levels (Page 115). Congress has not yet authorized this \$21.5 million development program.

(B) Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, \$37,400,000 (limit of existing authorization).

1. The National Park Service indicated to my staff last week that as of January 31, 1971, a sum of \$25,081,466 has been expended for land acquisition, \$3,643,437 for administration, and \$125,000 for relocation. Additional sums have been appropriated to the extent that only \$867,000 remains to be appropriated in fiscal year 1972 to reach the limit of the existing \$37.4 million Congressional authorization. The \$25 million spent for property in the park area has purchased some 20,000 acres of a total 47,000 acres to be acquired. Because only about two-fifths of the park land has been purchased, quick calculation indicates another \$35 million will be required for land and perhaps another \$5 million for administration and relocation, or a total of \$40 million more than the current authorization without providing for further cost escalation. Are these rough estimates reasonably accurate, and have I overlooked any additional costs which need to be considered?

Int: 1. The Corps of Engineers is updating, with the same appraisal contractor that provided original estimates, the cost estimate for remaining land to be acquired. This will produce the best estimate of additional costs that can be obtained. We are informed by the Corps that the estimates will have been developed by about June 1, and they will make the data immediately available to us.

One consideration that may contribute to reducing the straight line projection of costs used in phrasing the question is that the initial thrust of the acquisition program was to halt excessive cost escalation resulting from two active real estate developments (Hidden Lake, Pennsylvania and Blue Mountain Lakes, New Jersey) through immediate acquisition. This resulted in early acquisition of much expensive real estate. The land remaining to be acquired is not intensely developed although it is subject to speculative type development. Another consideration often overlooked is the fact some 1,300 acres of the gross authorized area of 46,375 acres will not be acquired having been eliminated pursuant to Sec. 2b of the Act. Also, there are 6,605 acres of publicly owned land which may be donated. The following calculation indicates fairly accurately the amount of land remaining to be acquired:

#### Acres

46,375—gross authorized.  
1,300—eliminated by legislation.  
6,605—donated or not acquired (publicly owned).  
20,060—acquired to date.  
18,410—Remaining to be purchased (base).

2. It is my understanding that Congress will be asked this year to increase the authorization for the park project. Can you tell us what additional, or supplemental, appropriation may be requested for fiscal 1972, once the authorization has been raised? Also, does that amount represent the maximum amount which could be utilized to advance the park portion of the project with reasonable speed during the next fiscal year?

Int: Refers to the estimate described above with respect to the capability of the Corps of Engineers to up-date cost estimates, to negotiate with landowners and to obligate available funds.

3. If all of the land acquisition money were available now, and a crash program of property acquisition were initiated, how many millions of dollars could be saved by averting further price escalation for property in the park portion?

Int: This would be affected by two major considerations. One would be normal price escalation of real estate which can be estimated. The other would be speculative development on land not yet acquired which may be undertaken. Whether or not an individual landowner will actually undertake development is conjectural until he begins. The Corps of Engineers have responsibility for negotiation and purchases of project and recreation area lands. That agency, ultimately, would have to evaluate its capability of successfully executing such a crash program.

4. Is there any reason why park property could not be acquired through bond revenues, again provided that such authority were enacted with appropriate guarantees for repayment on a regular basis?

Int: Appropriations for land acquisition out of the Land and Water Conservation Fund has furnished funds on schedule as requested. This process can continue at an increased rate as approved by the Congress. For this reason we believe it is not necessary to act through the issuance of revenue bonds.

5. A report released by the General Accounting Office, Oct. 1, 1969, indicated that the Corps and NPS had not reached agreement on a single plan for recreational development, that the two agencies had developed separate plans which differed significantly, and that the matter was still unresolved after more than three years. Has a

single plan been agreed upon, and what is that plan? If not, provide a comparison of the two plans with justification for areas of disagreement.

Corps: P.L. 88-874 and P.L. 89-158 provide the authority for water-related and non-water-related recreational development by the Corps of Engineers and the National Park Service, respectively, of the area encompassed by the Tocks Island Lake project, including the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. Each agency has prepared preliminary conceptual plans for recreational development on lands within their authorized project boundaries. The preliminary plan for ultimate water-related facility development prepared by the Corps of Engineers was submitted to and approved by the National Park Service in June, 1968. Four recreational sites presented in this plan have been proposed for initial development at the project and have been coordinated with and reviewed by the National Park Service. Recreational planning is continuing through mutual co-ordination at field level of each agency.

Int: There is no single plan for recreation development. The National Park Service Master Plan was completed in June, 1966, prior to the Corps' undertaking any planning of similar detail. The National Park Service plan included proposals for 29 water-related recreation developments in the reservoir project area, and was a plan based on an analysis of the available resources when the reservoir is completed relative to its recreation potential and carrying capacity. It did not reflect legislative funding ceilings of either the Corps of Engineers or the National Park Service relative to recreation development. The Corps of Engineers prepared, in 1968, a General Design Memorandum, Appendix E of which deals with the recreation aspects of the reservoir project. The Corps' proposal included 13 water-related sites, all of which are on similar sites in the National Park Service Master Plan, all identified by the same name, with the exception that one Corps site, Sandyston, incorporates both the Sandyston and Namanock sites of the National Park Service Master Plan. The Corps plan, then, actually proposes development of 14 of the 29 water-related sites identified by the National Park Service. Attached are two sheets of tabulations (Page 112) showing the comparison of the facilities proposed in each plan.

The tabulations indicate some general uniformity but considerable diversity in detail. The coordination of these two plans is a matter of considerable concern to the National Park Service because 1) we want to be assured of an efficiently operable recreation unit when the reservoir is completed; 2) we want to provide a full range of public recreation opportunities, including appropriate access to the reservoir and reflecting adequately the potential—and limitations—of the recreation resource; 3) we want a recreation development plan that provides for the preservation of the natural and cultural qualities on and near the reservoir shoreline.

We are seeking a clear understanding with the Corps relative to the mutual responsibilities of each agency for planning and construction. A memorandum of understanding to accomplish this is now being worked out between this Service and the Corps. A draft currently acceptable to the Corps of Engineers has recently been reviewed by the National Park Service and a number of minor revisions have been suggested. The document is now enroute to the Corps in final form for formal approval and signing.

## COMPARISON—CORPS OF ENGINEERS RECREATION PLAN, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MASTER PLAN

Development site	Picnic sites	(People) beach capacity	Camp sites	Boat ramps	Boat dock spaces	Boat beaching areas (boats)	Development site	Picnic sites	(People) beach capacity	Camp sites	Boat ramps	Boat dock spaces	Boat beaching areas (boats)
Pocono:							Buttermilk:						
National Park Service	280	2,000	270				National Park Service	70	210	116	13		
Corps of Engineers	403			6		25	Corps of Engineers	125					
Bushkill Creek:							Stillwater:						
National Park Service	970			24	500	80	National Park Service		200	91			
Corps of Engineers	791		290	25	400	125	Corps of Engineers	126			5		40
Dingmans Creek:							Walpack Bend:						
National Park Service	830	7,100		15		280	National Park Service	180	370	260			230
Corps of Engineers	910	7,200		4		125	Corps of Engineers	100					100
Indian Point:							Vancampens:						
National Park Service	30		50			80	National Park Service	330	4,500	580	8		
Corps of Engineers	150					50	Corps of Engineers	702	5,600	88			100
The Cliffs:							Calno:						
National Park Service	550	10,000					National Park Service	45	1,100	290			60
Corps of Engineers	998	10,000	200	6		75	Corps of Engineers	126			6		25
Minisink:							15 additional sites in National Park Service master plan not included in Corps of Engineers plan	3,157	12,660	740	65	930	570
National Park Service	410	8,000					Total:						
Corps of Engineers	798	6,000		6		50	National Park Service	8,112	65,540	3,197	135	1,840	1,300
Sandyston:							Corps of Engineers	7,260	48,000	978	78	840	815
National Park Service	1,000	13,000	800	10	410								
Corps of Engineers	1,176	12,000	400	16	440	50							
Flatbrook:													
National Park Service	260	6,400											
Corps of Engineers	855	7,200		4		50							

1 Includes National Park Service Namanock development site.

(C) Recreation Facilities in the Park, \$18,200,000 (Authorized by P.L. 89-158).

1. The 1969 GAO report noted that authorization of this expenditure is limited to development of recreational facilities upon lands acquired specifically for the park. What increase of this authorization is considered necessary to complete development only upon lands acquired for the park as the result of cost escalation through completion of the project?

Int: The development cost ceiling included in the legislation authorizing DWGNRA was based on 1959 construction cost indices, so at the time P.L. 89-158 was enacted (September 1, 1965) the cost estimates were six years old. During the six-year period, 1959-1965, general construction cost indices showed an average annual cost increase of about 7.0 percent. This would then have escalated the original estimate from \$18.2 million to \$27.3 million at the time the legislation was enacted. To continue to the present time over the last five-year period (1965-1970) would result in a total cost of \$46.3 million, with an average annual increase of 11.2 percent. If the determination is that the \$18.2 million authorized in 1965 will be the base it would have escalated to \$31.0 million by the end of 1970. At this point \$672,000 has been expended for recreation development in DWGNRA. Development which can be done independently of the reservoir will proceed progressively until the anticipated completion date, which coincides with the completion of the reservoir project. The rate of development, both of the recreation facilities in the DWGNRA and the Tocks Island Reservoir, is subject to many external conditions, most of which are not controlled by either agency. The anticipated rate of cost escalation is also unknown. It is virtually impossible, therefore, to determine how much will be completed in any given year before fiscal year 1972, thus removing that portion of the project from the effects of escalation.

(D) Recreational Facilities on the Reservoir, \$17,000,000. Cited in 1969 GAO Report (page 10).

1. Does this figure, which GAO contends has not been authorized represent an additional cost which requires authorization and appropriation? Is this a duplication of the sum cited under "C" above which would require only clarification of the authorization, rather than additional sums of money?

Corps: Initial development of water-related recreational facilities is to be limited to the level of costs contemplated in House

Document No. 522, 87th Congress, 2d Session, escalated for price level increases and design standards current at the time of installation. This development is estimated to cost \$17.7 million at July 1970 price levels. Future Federal expansion from the initial to the ultimate plan of water-related recreation development, would be staged over a ten year period and would involve an estimated additional facility cost of \$21.2 million at July 1970 price levels. This estimate represents the current value of the additional recreational facilities which were previously estimated to cost \$17 million at July 1968 price levels as cited on page 10 of the 1969 General Accounting Office report. Installation of these additional facilities would require further Congressional action.

The referenced \$17 million facility cost, now estimated at \$21.2 million at July 1970 price levels, is not a duplication of the \$18.2 million recreational facility cost cited under C, Recreation Facilities in the Park. The cited facility costs are separate and distinct.

Int: This represents additional cost over and above that presently authorized under the reservoir project and is not included under "C" above, which relates to the development of recreational facilities on national recreation area lands.

2. If this is an additional cost, what escalation of this figure is anticipated through completion of the development it is intended to cover?

Int: A meaningful projection of escalation to completion of this development, which is 20 years hence, is not practicable.

#### HARASSMENT OF U.S. FISHING FLEET BY SOVIET FISHERMEN DISCUSSED

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I testified before a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce regarding the flagrant harassment of our fishing fleet by Soviet fishermen.

Because of the importance of this issue and the need for immediate, effective action by the Congress, I am including my testimony before the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife for printing in the RECORD:

#### STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE MARGARET M. HECKLER

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am pleased to have this opportunity to meet with you on a matter of extreme urgency. The committee's display of quick concern is greatly appreciated.

I am particularly grateful to my distinguished colleague, Mr. Keith, who has a vital interest in this situation and with whose efforts and concern I associate myself.

We are faced with a crisis, Mr. Chairman, that borders on piracy on the high seas. And to compound it, this country is without recourse to legal redress in the face of this open and flagrant violation of international law. We are therefore being forced to seek other alternatives.

Not only is this series of incidents involving the fouling and damaging of lines and equipment by Soviet and other foreign vessels violative of international law, commerce and courtesy, but it is financially damaging to a regional industry that cannot afford it at a time when New England is wrestling with problems of economic recovery.

The Prelude Corp., of Westport, in my Congressional District, expects to suffer losses approaching a quarter of a million dollars as a result of Russian harassment and vandalism against its vessel, the Wiley Fox. Beyond this, there is the question of jobs and the future loss of potential revenue.

Only this morning, Mr. Chairman, there was another incident involving a Prelude ship, not 24 hours after an American negotiating team met with the Russian fleet commander aboard the Soviet mother ship on the high seas.

Mr. Joseph Gaziano, the president, and Mr. John Jensen, the treasurer, of the Prelude Corp., are with us here today, and I am sure will be happy to report fully to the committee on all the details surrounding these persistent acts of international hooliganism.

There are international conventions, to which the Russians are signatories, which apply in this case. One in particular, the 1958 Convention of Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas, has a number of provisions that are relevant to this situation.

One provides that a coastal state has a special interest in maintaining the productivity of the living resources in any areas of the high seas adjacent to its territorial sea.

Another states that a coastal state can regulate the conduct of fisheries in adjacent

high seas when devices fixed in the seabed are involved.

We are left then with two basic alternatives. One is the path of reasonableness and what is usually known as moral suasion. The other speaking and acting from a position of strength and resolution and facing down this foreign threat to an American industry in what to all intents and purposes are American waters.

So far, the State Department and the National Marine Fisheries Service have pursued the former path and it led nowhere until the harsh exposure of the news media brought the situation to a head. And that led to the negotiations aboard the Russian mother ship Wednesday. At the time the negotiations appeared to be successful and there was hope of final relief from many years of harrasing incidents.

And then, Mr. Chairman, dawn had not broken on the next day when 16 Russian fishing vessels tore through the gear of the boats. It is painfully obvious that more than pleasant conversations are necessary.

I propose, therefore, a four-point response by the United States to this situation:

1. As strongly worded a protest as possible from the U.S. to the appropriate Soviet Government agency.

2. Notification to the Russians of our intention to station a Coast Guard and/or naval vessel in the fishing waters permanently round the clock, followed by execution of this intention. If additional funds are required for this operation, I will make every effort to obtain them from the Congress.

3. Congressional approval of the joint resolution, introduced Tuesday by the distinguished gentleman from Washington, Mr. Pelly, which makes harassment of any American fishing vessel or gear unlawful, provides for Coast Guard surveillance, and extends the territorial waters of the United States for 100 miles.

4. Legislation should be approved to compensate the Prelude Corporation for its losses which are a direct result of this country's failure or inability to extend them national protection.

Only in this way, Mr. Chairman, can we act vigorously and forcibly to show the Russians, or any other fishing nation, that we mean business, that we mean to protect our own.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

#### THE NICETIES OF PROTOCOL ARE IRRELEVANT

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the U.S.S.R. announced today that the nine Soviet Jews on trial in Leningrad have been found guilty. The prison terms range from 1 to 10 years for the defendants. As I have reported to this House before, I went to the Soviet Union on March 29 and in the 8 days that I was in that country, I visited Leningrad. In Leningrad, I met with the families of two of the men on trial. Those two men, Lassal Kaminsky and Lev Yagman, each received 5 years. Having talked with their families, the outcome of the trials is particularly distressing to me.

During the course of the Leningrad trial, I urged the State Department that it request of the Soviet Union permission to have an American observer at the Leningrad trial. That trial was closed to the foreign press and I believe it would have been salutary had the United States

requested an opportunity to have an observer present. Who knows, perhaps permission would have been granted. I am sorry to report that I was advised that the Secretary of State would not make such a request because it was not provided for by existing consular treaty arrangements since no Americans were involved.

Mr. Speaker, surely the Secretary of State is not always limited by the narrow bounds of a consular convention of established procedure in the exercise of diplomacy. What would have been the harm in making the request? There are moral grounds for the United States to be concerned with the outcome of the trials. The people on trial are effectively being held captive in the Soviet Union in that they are not permitted to emigrate as is their right under the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights signed by the Soviet Union in 1969. If the Government of this country stands mute, and the Soviet Union is not made aware of the great interest in the United States and other countries in the outcome of these trials, there is little hope for any of the 25 Jews, nine of whom have now been convicted, with the balance awaiting trial in Riga and Kishnev. I hope that the Secretary of State will reconsider his position on this matter and request that a United States observer be permitted to attend the forthcoming trials.

Mr. Speaker, a tragedy is taking place in the Soviet Union involving not only the 25 Soviet Jews on trial, but tens of thousands of Jews in the Soviet Union. If we remain silent or send only pro forma letters so as not to violate the niceties of protocol, we must bear some of the responsibility for the developing tragedy. I urge our colleagues to write to the Secretary of State requesting that the United States take a stronger, public position on the matter of the trials and the policy of the Soviet Union prohibiting emigration of Soviet Jews to those countries to which they freely wish to go and which will accept them.

#### HEALTH PROGRAMS WHICH MUST BE SAVED

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, support of H.R. 7657 is increasing. The bill which would extend for an additional 5 years the children and youth comprehensive health projects and maternal and infant care projects which are now slated for oblivion as of June 30, 1972, has at this time 41 cosponsors. There are at present 67 children and youth programs and 57 maternal and infant care programs in existence delivering comprehensive health care to almost half a million children and youth of lower socioeconomic levels in central cities and rural areas. These projects represent one of the major reservoirs of experience in comprehensive health care today, especially to the poor children of the country.

I urge our colleagues to become cosponsors of this legislation. The pro-

grams which are endangered are listed below:

#### MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE PROJECTS

George H. Davis, M.D., Project Director, 211 West Lombard Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201.

James Paulissen, M.D., Chief, Division of Family Health, Illinois Department of Public Health, 535 W. Jefferson Street, Springfield, Illinois 62706.

Charles J. Berger, M.D., Acting Project Director, Bureau of Maternal and Child Health, P.O. Box 1258, 252 Hollister Bldg., Lansing, Michigan 48904.

I. A. Wiles, M.D., Director, M&I Project, Monongalia Co. Health Dept., Van Voorhis Road, Morgantown, West Virginia 25304.

Dr. Diego Collazo, M.D., Project Director, University District Hospital, Cappara Highas Station, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00935.

Daniel H. G. Glover, M.D., Project Director, Richmond Co. Health Dept., 1001 Ballie Drive, Augusta, Georgia 30902.

Edwin F. Dally, M.D., Project Director, 40 Worth Street, New York, New York 10013.

Ralph Gause, M.D., Chairman of Obstetrics and Gynecology, 40 Worth Street, New York, New York 10013.

Martin Stone, M.D., Prof. and Chairman, Dept. of Obstetrics and Gynecology, 40 Worth Street, New York, New York 10013.

Antero Lacot, M.D., Project Director, 40 Worth Street, New York, New York 10013.

Oscar Rivera Rivera, M.D., Project Coordinator, District Hospital, Ponce, Puerto Rico 00731.

Evelyn E. Hartman, M.D., Director, Maternal and Child Health, Minneapolis Health Department, 250 South Fourth Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415.

Kristine S. Knisley, M.D., Director, Maternal and Child Health, 500 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19146.

Carl G. Ashley, M.D., Director, Maternal and Child Health, Oregon State Board of Health, P.O. Box 231, Portland, Oregon 97207.

Ronald M. Foote, M.D., Project Director, 775 Main Street, Buffalo, New York 14203.

Byron L. Hawks, M.D., Project Director, State Health Building, Little Rock, Arkansas 72202.

Milton S. Saslaw, M.D., MPH, Project Director, Dade County Department of Public Health, 1350 N.W. 14th Street, Miami, Florida 33125.

Luella Klein, M.D., Project Director, Grady Memorial Hospital, 80 Butler Street, S.E., Atlanta, Georgia 30303.

William Smiley, M.D., Project Director, 1421 North Jefferson Avenue, Saint Louis, Missouri 63106.

Isolde E. Loevinger, M.D., Director, Bureau of Maternal and Child Health, 101 Grove Street, San Francisco, California 94102.

A. Marion Pecora, M.D., Project Director, Maternity and Infant Care Project, 87 Broad Street, Newark, New Jersey 07102.

Jorge Deju, M.D., Director, Division of Maternal & Child Health, Kentucky State Dept. of Health, 275 East Main Street, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601.

Newton E. Howe, D.D.S., Interim Medical Director, Tri-County District Health Dept., 180 East Hampden Avenue, Englewood, Colorado 80110.

Horace E. Thompson, M.D., Director, Obstetrics and Gynecology, Denver Dept. of Health and Hospitals, West 8th Avenue & Cherokee St., Denver, Colorado 80204.

Brian Little, M.D., Project Director, Maternity Infant Care Project, Metropolitan General Hospital, 3395 Scranton Road, Cleveland, Ohio 44115.

Edward R. Wernitznig, M.D., Director, Maternity & Infant Care Project, 801 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002.

John T. King, M.D., Acting Director, Maternal and Child Health Section, Personal Health Division, State Board of Health, 225 N. McDowell Street, Raleigh, North Carolina 27602.

Charles A. Field, M.D., Project Director, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Nebraska, College of Medicine, Omaha, Nebraska 68105.

Harry Baldock, M.D., Project Director & Project Pediatrician, 1800 East Washington Street, Charleston, West Virginia 25305.

Virginia E. Washburn, M.D., Project Director, Allegheny County Health Dept., 3447 Forbes Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213.

Louise Childs, M.D., Chief, Maternal & Child Health, State Department of Health, P.O. Box 3378, Honolulu, Hawaii 96801.

Cecil Jacobs, M.D., Project Director, Charleston County Health Dept. 334 Calhoun Street, Charleston, South Carolina 29401.

Jessie E. Parkinson, M.D., Director, Maternal & Child Health, Hartford Health Department, 56 Coventry Street, Hartford, Connecticut 06112.

Alan Foord, M.D., Director, Maternal & Child Health, Dept. of Public Health, 2121 McKinley Avenue, Berkeley, California 94704.

Lois M. Mosey, M.D., Project Director, Hinds-Rankin County Health Department, 514-B E. Woodrow Wilson, Jackson, Mississippi 39216.

R. V. Jones, M.D., Director, Houston Health Department, 1114 North MacGregor, Houston, Texas 77025.

Laurence Maze, M.D., Project Director, MIC Project 536, 206 S. Florissant Road, Ferguson, Missouri 63135.

Jess B. Spielholz, M.D., Deputy Director, Chief, Division of Health Services, Public Health Building, Olympia, Washington 98502.

Mary Jo Tonelli, M.D., Director, Grayson County Health Department, Box 1295, Sherman, Texas 75090.

Wilfred N. Sisk, M.D., Project Director, Orange County Health Dept., 832 West Central Blvd., Box 3187, Orlando, Florida 32805.

Michael S. Pecora, M.D., Chief, Maternal & Child Health, State Department of Health, Statehouse, Boise, Idaho 83707.

Jean M. Maynard, M.D., Project Director, Division of Child Health, Rhode Island Dept. of Health, Suite 302, Davis Street, Providence, Rhode Island 02908.

R. W. Penick, M.D., Health Officer, Greenville County Health Dept., Greenville, South Carolina 29602.

William E. Winikow, M.D., District Health Officer, Reno-Washoe Health Department, 10 Kirman Avenue, Reno, Nevada 89502.

Mary T. Tiller, M.D., Project Director, Jefferson County Department of Health, 1912 8th Avenue, South, Birmingham, Alabama 35233.

Richard D. Bryant, M.D., Project Director, Maternity & Infant Care Project, Board of Health, Park Towers 2517 Burnet Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio 45219.

Berel Held, M.D., Project Director, M&I Project, Florida State Dept. of Health and Rehabilitative Services, 412 N.E. 16th Avenue, Gainesville, Florida 32601.

Paul W. Hughes, M.D., M.P.H., Project Director, Broward County Health Dept., 2421 S.W. Sixth Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33302.

Carl F. Coffelt, M.D. (Interim Director), Head Public Health Physician, 220 North Broadway, Los Angeles, California 90012.

Laura Edwards, M.D., Project Director, St. Paul-Ramsey Hospital, 640 Jackson Street, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101.

C. L. Brumback, M.D., Director, Palm Beach County Health Dept., Box 29, West Palm Beach, Florida 33402.

George W. Newburn, Jr., M.D., Health Officer, Mobile Co. Board of Health, 248 Cox Street, Mobile, Alabama 36604.

Frances G. Maltese, M.D., Project Director, 500 N. 10th Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219.

Marguerite C. Dunham, M.D., Director, Division of Maternal and Child Health, Department of Health and Welfare, Statehouse, Augusta, Maine 04330.

Dorothy J. Worth, M.D., Director, Maternity and Infant Care Project, State Department of Public Health, 480 Tremont Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02116.

Perry A. Henderson, M.D., Project Director, Maternity and Infant Care Program, The University of New Mexico School of Medicine, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106.

Henry W. Foster, M.D., Project Director, Maternity and Infant Care, Chief of Obstetrics and Gynecology, J. A. Andrew Memorial Hospital, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama 36088.

Edward J. Ward, M.D., Director, Maternity and Infant Care Project, 15th and Upland, Upland, Chester, Pennsylvania 19013.

#### CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROJECTS

##### REGION I

Director, C & Y Project 602, Beth Israel Hospital, 330 Brookline Ave., Boston, Mass. 02115.

Selma Deitch, M.D., Director, C & Y Project 635, State Health Dept., 61 S. Spring St., Concord, N.H. 03301.

Advin Novack, M.D., Director, C & Y Project 651, Hill Health Center, 428 Columbus Ave., New Haven, Conn.

John Connelly, M.D., Director, C & Y Project 659 Bunker Hill Center, 73 High St., Charlestown, Mass. 02129.

Anthony Jong, D.D.S., Director, C & Y Project 632, 484 Tremont St., Boston, Mass. 02116.

Robert Rosenberg, M.D., C & Y Project 632A, Martha Elliot Center, 33 Bickford St., Jamaica Plain, Mass. 02130.

##### REGION II

Saul Krugman, M.D., C & Y Project 605, N.Y.U. Med. Center, Bellevue Hosp., 550 First Ave., N.Y. 10016.

Director, C & Y Project 610, Project PRYME, 67-10 Rockaway Bch, Blvd. Avenue, N.Y. 11692.

Katherine Lobach, M.D., Director, C & Y Project 614A, 1175 Morris Park Ave., N.Y. City.

Mutya San Augustin, M.D., Director, C & Y Project 614B, Montefiore Hosp., N.Y. City.

Fred Tunick, M.D., Director, C & Y Project, 628 Brooklyn Jewish Hosp., Brooklyn, N.Y.

Pierre Severgens, M.D., Director, C & Y Project 629, Virgin Islands, P.O. Box 1442, St. Thomas, V.I. 00801.

Director, C & Y Project 630, Beth Israel Med. Center, 10 Nathan Dr., Pearlman Pl., N.Y. 10003.

Fred Green, M.D., Director, C & Y Project 645 Roosevelt Hosp., 430 W. 59th St., N.Y. 10019.

Director, C & Y Project 653, Brookdale Hosp. Center, 9620 Church Ave., Brooklyn, N.Y. 11212.

Director, C & Y Project 655, Drew Neighborhood Health Center, 425 Howard Ave., Brooklyn, N.Y. 11233.

##### REGION III

Jimmy Rhyne, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj., 606 American Bldg., Rm. 800, Baltimore and South St., Baltimore, Md. 21202.

Director, C & Y Proj. 606A, Community Pediatric Center, Univ. of Maryland School of Med., 412-420 W. Redwood St., Baltimore, Maryland, 21201.

Director, C & Y Proj. 606B, Sinai-Druid Comprehensive Pediatric Center, 1515 W. North Ave., Baltimore, Maryland, 21217.

Director, C & Y Proj. 606C, Greater Baltimore Med. Center, Presbyterian Hosp., 1017 E. Baltimore St., Baltimore, Maryland 21202.

Zsolt H. Koppányi, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 606D, Baltimore City Hospitals, 4940 Eastern Ave., Baltimore, Maryland 21224.

Nell Sims, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 609, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland.

Director, C & Y Proj. 612, 1701 Fitzwater St., Phil., Penn. 19146.

W. G. Thurman, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 613, U. of Va. School of Medicine, 1924 Arlington, Charlottesville, Va. 22903.

Edwin Harrington, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 618, Jeff. Med. Coll., 1332 Fitzwater St., Philadelphia, Pa. 19107.

Guilio Barbero, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 619, Hahnemann Med. Coll., 230 N. Broad St., Phil., Pa. 19102.

Vince Hutchins, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 620, Med. Coll. of Pa. 3300 Henry Ave., Philadelphia, Pa. 19129.

Director, C & Y Proj. 623, Comprehensive Health Services Group, 2539 Germantown, Phil., Pa. 19133.

Hilary Miller, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 631, 801 N. Capitol, Wash., D.C. 20001.

William Oberman, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 627, Children's Hosp. 2125 13th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009.

James Chappel, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 654, Children's Hosp. of Pittsburgh, 1125 DeSota St., Pittsburgh, Pa. 15213.

Yvonne Creteur, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 657, Norfolk City HD, 425 W. 35th St., Norfolk, Va. 23508.

##### REGION IV

Nancy Thornton, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 615, Med. Coll. of Ga. Dept. of Ped., Augusta, Ga. 30902.

William Daniel, Jr., M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 622, U. of Ala. Children's Hospital, Birmingham, Ala. 35233.

Sarah Morrow, M.D., C & Y Medical Director, Guilford Co. H.D., Proj. 625, 300 E. Northwood, Greensboro, N.C. 27401.

David Jones, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 626, Le Bonheur Children's Hosp. 848 Adams Ave., Memphis, Tenn. 39103.

Milton Saslow, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 636, Dade County Dept. of Public Health, 1350 NW 14th St., Dade Co., Fla.

E. Perry Crump, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 637, Meharry Med. Coll. Nashville, Tenn.

Fred Seligman, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 638, Univ. of Miami School of Medicine, Miami, Fla. 33152.

Billy Andrews, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 656, Univ. of Louisville School of Med., 323 E. Chestnut, Louisville, Ky. 40202.

##### REGION V

William Morrow, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 601, New North Children's Center, 1441 N. Cleveland, Chicago 60610.

Evelyn Hartman, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 603, Minneapolis H.D., 250 S. 4th St., Minneapolis, Minn. 55415.

Phil Ambuel, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 607, 561 S. 17th St., Columbus, Ohio, 43205.

Gerry Rice, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 616, Michigan State H.D., Lansing, Mich.

George Sperry, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 617, Barney's Children's Med. Center, 1735 Chapel St., Dayton, Ohio, 45404.

Jean Smelker, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 603A, 2016 16th Ave., South Minneapolis, Minn. 55404.

##### REGION VI

Heinz Eichenwald, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 647, Southwestern Med. School, 5323 Harry Hines, Dallas, Texas. 75235.

Jimmy Simon, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 648, U. of Tex. Med. Br. Sealy-Smith Med. Bldg., Galveston, Texas 77550.

Director, C & Y Proj. 660, Corpus Christi-Driscoll-Found. Ch. Hosp., Corpus Christi, Texas.

Roger B. Bost, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 658, U. of Arkansas Med. Center, 4301 W. Markham, Little Rock, Ark. 72201.

##### REGION VII

Ned Smull, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 604, Children's Mercy Hosp., 1710 Independence Ave., Kansas City, Mo. 64106.

Wilks Hiatt, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 621, U. of Kansas, 39th and Rainbow, Kansas City, Kan. 66103.

Alice Moriaty, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj.

641, Topeka-Shawnee County Health Dept., 1615 W. 8th St., Topeka, Kansas 66606.

Charles Kline, D.O., P.D. Director, C & Y Proj. 642, Kirksville Coll. of Osteopathy, 800 W. Jefferson St., Kirksville, Mo. 63501.

Robert Kugel, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 643, U. of Nebraska School of Med. 42nd and Dewey St. Omaha, Nebr. 68105.

Matilda McIntire, C & Y Proj. Director, Proj. 644, C.H.D. Creighton U., 11th and Dorcas Sts., Omaha, Nebr. 68108.

#### REGION VIII

William Haynes, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 611, Tri County H.D., 180 E. Hampden, Englewood, Colo. 80110.

Edward Dreyfus, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 624, Dept. of Health and Hospitals, 657 Cherokee St., Denver, Colo.

K. Dawson, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 633, 35 11th Ave., Helena, Mont. 59601.

E. K. Akers, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 634, Las Animas-Huerfano Co. State Dept. of Health, 4210 E. 11th Ave., Denver, Colo.

#### REGION IX

Charles Wellington, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 640, Mt. Zion Hosp., 1600 Divisadero St., San Francisco, Calif. 94115.

Louise Childs, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 646, S.H.D., P.O. Box 3378, Honolulu, Hawaii 96801.

Pearl M. Tong, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 649, Maricopa Co. H.D., P.O. Box 2111, Phoenix, Ariz. 85001.

Loren MacKinney, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 650, East L.A. C & Y Clinic, 929 N. Bonnie Place, L.A. 90063.

Director, C & Y Proj. 652, Alameda Co. H.D., Oakland, Calif.

#### REGION X

Charles Keck, M.D., Director, C & Y Proj. 639, Seattle King Co., Dept. of Health, 3722 S. Hudson, Seattle, Washington 98118.

### THE LEAD AND ZINC ACT OF 1971

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that will have a beneficial effect on the domestic economy and will also provide for stable prices as well as for an adequate supply of lead and zinc to U.S. consumers. I hope that many of my colleagues in the House will join me in supporting this worthwhile legislation.

The lead and zinc mining and smelting industries in the United States have been the subject of discussion on this floor many times over the past 15 years. On each of these occasions, as on this one, the purpose has been to bring to the attention of the Congress the uncertainties and instability prevailing in these important elements of the country's natural resource economy and to propose measures to correct the deficiencies which constitute a threat to our national security and to our industrial economy.

The conditions within these industries, our serious dependency on foreign sources and the lack of incentive to preserve and revitalize lead and zinc production in the United States are of even greater urgency today. Measures must be found to meet this situation.

The measure here proposed basically amends the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for rates of duty higher than present rates after certain quantitative levels of imports in

given periods have been reached. It puts no absolute quantitative limitations on the importation of lead and zinc materials and articles specified in the bill.

The principal purpose of the measure is to provide sound economic stability for the lead and zinc industries in the United States and thereby to preserve existing mining and smelting facilities and encourage discovery and development of new and known reserves and expansion of smelting facilities within the United States.

Such stability heretofore has not been possible by reason of the fact that the U.S. market for lead and zinc and the industries that produce these in this country have too long been subject to the pressures and influence of lead and zinc imports originating in lower cost foreign economies. The effect of these imports, which presently are virtually uncontrolled, is profound and market prices in the United States generally have been keyed more to the lower cost foreign economies than to costs of production prevailing in the U.S. economy.

The instability and uncertainties thus relentlessly thrust on U.S. lead and zinc industries has made it impossible for these industries to have the confidence in the future that is a basic requirement for sound natural resource development and the investment of funds. Lacking this confidence the industries have not been able to operate on a stable basis or to keep pace with expanding needs of lead and zinc for national and industrial security. In fact, they have lost ground at an alarming rate.

In recent months we have seen the closing of an important and long-established zinc smelter with two others now being phased out. A fourth one will be closing at the end of July. Some zinc mines are being phased out because they cannot stand current economic pressures. Known reserves are not being developed as they should be because economic projections cannot be made with certainty. Our dependency on foreign sources becomes greater.

The Mining and Minerals Policy Act of December 31, 1970 (Public Law 91-631), among other things, calls for the development of economically sound and stable domestic mining, minerals and metal industries and the orderly and economic development of domestic mineral resources and reserves to help assure satisfaction of industrial and security needs.

The objectives of that policy with respect to lead and zinc cannot be achieved unless confidence in the future can be instilled with assurance that the Nation needs and wants soundly developed and expanding lead and zinc mining and smelting industries and that the expenditure of effort and money to achieve these will not be undermined by the impact of undue and uncontrolled imports.

The measure here under consideration will go a long way toward creating that confidence in the future.

The quantitative limitations proposed in this bill are moderate. They bear entirely reasonable relation to our current requirements of imports of metal and of ores needed by our smelting industries to supplement current levels of domestic

mine production. They likewise have reasonable relation to average imports over the past several years.

Consequently, the higher rates of duty would not apply under ordinary and immediately foreseeable circumstances but would apply only at a point where without imposition of them efforts could be made to displace U.S. production with imports in excess of real need. An invasion of the U.S. market by the usual practice of cutting prices below economic levels of U.S. producers would no longer be possible.

With one exception the bill provides that the present rates of duty shall apply until the quantitative limitations have been reached with the higher rates of duty applying thereafter.

The exception is in the case of zinc ores. Here the bill provides that imports up to the quantitative limitation shall be entered free of duty rather than at the present rate of .67 cents per pound. On imports beyond the quantitative limitation the present rate of duty would be restored.

This exception is proposed because an important part of zinc metal production in the United States is from the processing of imported ores in U.S. smelters. These smelters must compete at foreign sources for their import requirements and the relaxing of the duty on zinc ores will improve their position.

It is in the national interest to preserve the smelting industry at reasonable capacity not only because it is a long established part of our metals economy and an important employer but also for the reason that existing and new smelting capacity may be needed to process increasing quantities of mine production in the United States which may become available under the more stable long-range conditions that this measure can create.

This measure can and will generate confidence that will lead to more stable and determinable conditions in the lead and zinc mining and smelting industries in the United States. Under these conditions these industries will be placed in a position not only to preserve what we now have but also will be encouraged to expand mining and smelting activities so that much of the growing consumption requirements can be met from domestic sources in future years. Such a course is vital to our national and industrial security. To make it possible is demanded by the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, I could not improve upon the explanation of this bill, just offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL). However, I would like to take just a moment to call attention to the importance of this measure to the State of Idaho.

Idaho ranks second among the States in lead mine production. We produced 59,667 short tons last year, and that represents nearly one-fourth of the entire national production.

As a producer of recoverable zinc, Idaho always ranks among the top three. The production figure for 1970 was 40,457 short tons.

We know the relationship between sta-

bility in the mining community and the economy of Idaho. Several years ago, a prolonged strike in the lead mines had a disastrous effect on the economy of the Wallace-Kellogg area and all of the Idaho Panhandle.

But my interests in this measure are twofold—one is necessarily parochial, but the other national. Today, the lead-zinc industry has its back to the wall, threatened by cheap foreign labor and increased attention to environmental matters. Allegations against the industry and proposed solutions for admitted problems are not at issue as far as this bill is concerned. Suffice to say, the lead producers in this country—beleaguered as they are by various domestic problems—should not be expected to suffer at the hands of unfair foreign competition as well.

The national security demands that the instability which has characterized so much of the mining industry in recent years be minimized. This bill takes an important step in that direction. I commend the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for spearheading the effort which culminated in the introduction of this measure today. It is a pleasure for me to add my name as a cosponsor.

#### LET US NOT SELL NATIONALIST CHINA DOWN THE RIVER

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, events of recent weeks have caused some of us to wonder whether the United States is moving toward a policy of selling the Nationalist Chinese down the river to seek favor with the Communist Government of Mainland China. Such an action would be a grievous mistake. Many nations, particularly those who have fought on our side in Southeast Asia, will be watching with apprehension until our true intentions are revealed. If our Nation is to retain credibility as a leader in the affairs of mankind, we simply cannot afford to turn our backs on good and true friends of many years in exchange for a will-of-the-wisp relationship with Communist China.

In the dark years of the late 1930's and the early 1940's, the Chinese people under a Nationalist government stood as a rock in the path of Japanese aggression. Their country fought at our side throughout the trying period of World War II. In all of this the Chinese served as an inspiration to freedom-loving peoples. The history books bulge with accounts of their heroic determination. Many of them died befriending American servicemen.

Then came the takeover of Mainland China through Communist duplicity, as is their customary procedure. But the fact that they are Communist-controlled does not necessarily mean that the Chinese people are Communist-oriented. Their government seeks to accomplish among neighbor countries the same

takeover of governments through rebellion or duplicity which was practiced in Mainland China. America, which more than any other nation has stood in the way of this takeover of Southeast Asia, has been Communist China's principal hate target. The fight for self-determination among the nations of Southeast Asia depends primarily upon the fact that we have stood at their side and that we continue to provide support, both material and morale. It is not a time to abandon our friends unless we at the same time are prepared to abandon Southeast Asia to communism.

Many feel the President has been overly hasty in making concessions to the Communist Government of mainland China. Undoubtedly they are amazed at the extent of the concessions already granted. By all the rules of diplomacy, they would not have expected to gain these without long negotiations and a measure of reciprocal action. All of this advantage has been gained by the Communists for doing nothing more than extending an invitation to a pingpong team which the Chinese knew they could defeat. And do not think for a moment the Chinese have not made it plain to the world that they did defeat the American team.

While this has been taking place, their Government has continued to criticize the United States. There has to be a better way to win friends and to influence people than for us to wait, hat in hand, on the pleasure of Red China.

If the administration is determined to move toward a closer relationship with the Communist Government of mainland China, public assurances should be given that it continues to be the policy of the United States to stand by the Nationalist Chinese. Their loyalty to free world doctrines is not in question. Their friendship is certain. They helped to keep the brakes on Red Chinese dreams of aggression at a time when there were few who were willing to be counted on our side. It should be made clear that it continues to be the policy of the United States to stand by strong and dependable friends. Let former enemies join us if they choose, but let us not join them on their terms.

#### AMERICAN LEGION, LUBBOCK, TEX., RESOLUTION

(Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion is a vigilant and powerful force in the Nation. The Legion is dedicated to the preservation of our liberties and our cherished institutions of freedom.

The annual convention of the American Legion of the 19th Congressional District which I have the honor to represent was held in Lubbock, Tex., on April 25, 1971. At this meeting, the American Legion passed a resolution in strong support of our country and in condemnation of our Communist ene-

mies who seek to undermine and destroy the U.S. Government.

The resolution speaks for itself and I wish to endorse it and submit it for printing in the RECORD. Eternal vigilance continues to be the price of liberty and I wish to congratulate the American Legion of the 19th Congressional District for its dedicated pursuit of this goal.

The resolution follows:

#### RESOLUTION CONDEMNING DEMONSTRATIONS ASSISTING COMMUNISM

Whereas, It is always the responsibility of the American Legion to speak out on matters which affect our national security, and

Whereas, The growing Communist-inspired demonstrations, agitation, and sabotage are endangering our nation to an ever increasing degree,

Now therefore be it resolved, We of the American Legion urge all patriotic citizens to join with us in denouncing and condemning the recent mass demonstrations in our nation's capital which gave aid and comfort to our Communist enemies by their waving of Communist flags, displaying the clinched fist of Communism, and proclaiming the Communist line, and

Furthermore be it resolved, That we, commend the Chairman of the U.S. House Committee on Internal Security, Rep. Richard Ichord, for disclosing in the Congressional Record of April 6, 1971 (pages 9787-9790) that two major groups leading the recent capital demonstrations, namely the National Peace Action Council, and People's Coalition for Peace and Justice, "are known to be operating under substantial Communist influence", and also revealing that among the top leadership of the People's Coalition for Peace and Justice are such well known Communist Party Functionaries as Gilbert Green and Jarvis Tyner, members of the Communist party's National Committee in addition to other named Communists, and

Furthermore be it resolved, Realizing that this nation will be destroyed from within if we permit the Communist-inspired treasonable activities to continue to accelerate, and realizing that we cannot permit this nation to be conquered from within or from without by the Communists regardless of what measures must be taken to prevent their activities causing our enslavement, we therefore petition Congress, and President Nixon, for redress of our grievance and requesting that the activities giving aid and comfort and assistance to our Communist enemies be curtailed, that our nation might live, and

Furthermore be it resolved, That our Commander see that good publicity be given this resolution, with a copy to our U.S. Senators and Congressmen from Texas, as well as to the President of the U.S.A.

#### SIXTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THE SOVEREIGN CUBAN REPUBLIC

(Mr. ALBERT, at the request of Mr. Boggs, was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, today, May 20, marks the 69th anniversary of the birth of sovereign Cuban Republic. On this date in 1902, the Cuban people realized a dream for which all of them—the patriots and soldiers, the theorists and strategists, and the common people of that island territory had striven and sacrificed for almost a century.

In pausing today to honor Cuban independence, we cannot but feel a sense of the tragic irony which this commemoration generates. For today, under Fidel Castro, the Cuban patriots' dreams of self-determination and government based on liberty and justice are as far from realization as they were centuries ago under Spanish colonial rule.

Fidel Castro swept into power in Cuba as a hero, a "man of the people," a liberator of the downtrodden masses from the vicious and barbaric control of Fulgencio Batista. Castro promised his supporters that he would restore to them the governmental traditions which were rightly theirs: democracy, justice, respect for human rights, freedom.

In fact, what Fidel Castro did was to substitute his own tyranny for that of Batista. The Cuban way of life has become the Castro way of life. In his relentless pursuit of power and world prestige, Castro has denied his people the fruits of liberty and caused them to endure extreme deprivations, not only of the spirit, but of the basic physical necessities of life. The "noble" cause for which the masses of Cuban citizens are so ardently laboring is not that of a better way of life for themselves and their children, but to gratify a gargantuan ego—to enable Fidel Castro to show the world, and especially the other nations of this hemisphere, that he has indeed achieved greatness.

The Latin American nations are not fooled by his propaganda campaign. Government leaders throughout the hemisphere are well aware that Castro's claims to the first "successful socialist experiment" in Latin America are a sham. They reject his pronouncements that Cuba will serve as a model for Latin American governments in the future. They know, as we do, that this leader of Latin America's downtrodden masses has, even in his own country, ignored the basic elements of humaneness.

Although today the observance of Cuban independence is cause for sadness among friends of the Cuban people everywhere, it is not without strong elements of hope and faith in a better future for them. We know that the spark of liberty still lives in Cuba. It lives in the many reports of sabotage, subversion, and other forms of resistance to Castro tyranny which find their way out of Cuba. It lives in accounts of the growing disaffection of the Cuban laborers, the very backbone of Castro's revolution. It lives in the many incidents of daring escape by Cubans who would rather risk their lives than suffer totalitarian enslavement. At this moment throughout Cuba, people are proving once more that tyranny can never triumph over the minds and souls of men.

On this day, we offer our salute to the spirit of the Cuban people, to their strength, their endurance, to their courage, demonstrated in the many years of trial, and hardship which they have endured without letting the flame of freedom be extinguished in their hearts. Their struggle continues, and we share

in their faith that their cause shall triumph.

#### MINORITY LEADER FORD SPEAKS OUT

(Mr. DEVINE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, last night our distinguished minority leader, GERALD FORD of Michigan addressed the National Federation of Independent Businessmen.

Mr. FORD was warmly received and was interrupted by enthusiastic applause more than 20 times as he discussed the President and his domestic and foreign policies.

I am pleased to include the text of Mr. FORD's speech:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD, BEFORE THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESSMEN

Good evening. It is a great pleasure to be here among men who are truly independent and who are devoted to the principles of free enterprise.

Life is difficult for the small businessmen in this age of commercial giants, I know. But I feel that times will become steadily better in the months ahead—and I do not say this only because I tend to be eternally optimistic.

Things have already become a little easier for politicians in the age—the *Space Age*. There was a time when we only *promised* people the moon. Now we can actually *deliver* on that promise.

There are also, of course, a few things we can promise here on *earth* and deliver on, if given only a little help by the American people.

Those words—a little help—are terribly important, particularly if the promise is a pledge to end the Vietnam War in a way that will help to avoid future wars.

I don't know if we can end the Vietnam War—because it takes both sides to make peace.

But I do believe we can end U.S. involvement in Vietnam in the right way—if not through a negotiated peace in Paris, then by turning the war over to the South Vietnamese in an orderly and well-timed fashion.

I am not speaking in a partisan vein tonight. This is one reason I have chosen to speak with you about Vietnam and what the future may hold there. If there is any subject which should be nonpartisan, it is Vietnam.

It has been said that the world is now too dangerous for anything but truth. I certainly believe that, and so I would like to speak a few truths here tonight that have escaped some of us lately.

One of those truths is that the President of the United States is the only man who can liquidate the American role in Vietnam and extricate us from that horrible war.

Another of those truths is that the President is as anxious as anyone else in this country to bring about U.S. disengagement from the Vietnam War as quickly as practicable.

Still another truth is that public policy—American foreign policy affecting war and peace—cannot safely be made in the streets. The April 24 Peace March notwithstanding, crowd diplomacy is no sane substitute for carefully considered and ordered policy formulated at the highest levels of the United States Government. Chants of "out now," even if led by a United States senator, are no answer for the fearfully complicated ques-

tion of how best to end our involvement in Vietnam.

We all want to end our involvement in Vietnam. All of us. The President, who inherited the war, and you and I.

The President, regardless of the war's history, has the terrible burden of ending the American role in Vietnam. We should help him with it.

How can we help the President liquidate the American role in Vietnam? We can and should support him as he pursues his policy of gradual withdrawal from Vietnam—a policy which has reduced U.S. strength in Vietnam to a current level of 262,500 and will bring it down to 184,000 by next Dec. 1.

If U.S. troop withdrawals from Vietnam continue beyond Dec. 1 at the present pace, we will be down to 55,000 troops by next Sept. 1—the figure generally talked about as a "residual force." Our goal is total withdrawal. It will be achieved.

There are those who are calling for a publicly announced pullout date, as demanded by the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong. The date most frequently mentioned is Dec. 31, 1971. What purpose would it serve for the President to announce we would pull out by that date? Is such an announcement in the best interests of our side? No, it would only serve the purposes of the enemy.

We would be removing the enemy's incentive to end U.S. involvement sooner by negotiation.

We would be giving the enemy the information needed to marshal attacks against our remaining forces at their most vulnerable time.

So a publicly announced pullout date serves no useful purpose, and in any case we will be substantially out of Vietnam by early next fall. When we talk about early next fall as against Dec. 31, 1971, we are really talking about only a few months' difference in time.

Why are some of the leaders of the April 24 Peace March and the May Day disturbances so determined to get us out of Vietnam now? Because these leaders are anxious to promote a Communist victory in Vietnam. Not to take anything away from the thousands of well-meaning Americans who follow these leaders without regard for their ideological coloration. They no doubt are sincere. But policy on this vital issue cannot be made in the streets, and it certainly should not be made by radicals who try to tear down the American Flag and raise the Viet Cong flag in its place.

We are succeeding in thwarting a Communist takeover in South Vietnam by force. If we now were to withdraw all of our forces swiftly and precipitously, we would be acquiescing in Communist conquest of Vietnam.

I know the American people are tired of the Vietnam War. But is surrender in Vietnam what they really want? I don't believe it for a minute, and a poll by the Opinion Research Corporation substantiates it. When asked if they favor pullout of all American troops by the end of 1971 even if this meant a Communist takeover, only 27 per cent said "yes," and 57 per cent said "no." The rest were undecided.

North Vietnam and the Viet Cong have repeatedly made it plain that they expect growing protests in the United States to speed the end of the Vietnam War on their terms. I don't believe that is going to happen. I believe the majority of the American people support the President on the crucial issue of gradual withdrawal with success versus precipitous withdrawal and defeat.

Do we have any business being in Vietnam? Is the Vietnam War a civil war in which we have intervened without good cause?

Anyone who believes the Vietnam War is a civil war is either not knowledgeable or is forgetful of the facts—the fact that after the Indochina War ended North Vietnam refused to accept the U.S. proposal of UN-supervised elections, that North Vietnam and France were therefore the only nations who signed the Geneva Accords in 1954, that the Communist Party in North Vietnam executed more than 50,000 people during the following two-year period, that the Communist Party in North Vietnam herded more than a half million people into forced labor camps or re-education centers, that the Communist Party of North Vietnam had also ordered 80,000 to 100,000 Southern Communists to go North at the time of the Geneva Conference to train and prepare in the North to return to South Vietnam to organize the Communist vote in the South in 1956, that these Southern men returned to the South under Northern orders to begin a guerrilla war, that most of these Southerners had been sent back to the South by Hanoi by 1964, that in September and October of 1964 the first regular Army units of the North Vietnamese Army moved down the Ho Chi Minh Trail through Laos into South Vietnam.

It was only the U.S. response with combat forces that prevented the collapse of South Vietnam. There are today some 160,000 North Vietnamese soldiers in the South, a force that constitutes an actual invasion of the South from the North.

The ongoing U.S. troop withdrawals from South Vietnam are timed so as to enable South Vietnam to meet the Communist challenge from the North.

The way the war can be most speedily resolved is by meaningful negotiations at Paris. If Hanoi continues to refuse to negotiate, then President Nixon's Vietnamization program—the strengthening of the South militarily, politically and economically—is a constant reminder to the North that as they daily the South Vietnamese are being given more time and weapons training to deal with them.

We have been actively fighting in Vietnam for six years. That is a long time. But the Communist North has been trying to conquer South Vietnam for 17 years—ever since the Geneva Armistice.

This war belongs to the Vietnamese and we should give it back to them. But we must do it in orderly fashion, in a way that bestows strength on the South Vietnamese and discourages Communist aggression—now and for the future.

President Nixon is salvaging the tremendous investment we have made in Vietnam. You can argue that we never should have become involved in Vietnam in the first place—that both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson made a mistake. But I don't think you can argue against President Nixon's salvage operation.

It is not a matter of saving face. It is a matter of giving South Vietnam a decent chance to survive as an independent, non-Communist nation.

Sincere advocates of precipitous withdrawal from Vietnam are ignoring the consequences of such action. Our allies in Southeast Asia are waiting to see if the Communists are right in saying Americans do not have the moral stamina to persevere in the defense of freedom in South Vietnam and the preservation of the diversities that the proud peoples and societies of Asia represent.

I believe in freedom, and I believe freedom is diminished throughout the world whenever another country disappears behind the Bamboo or Iron Curtains.

Recently sharp attacks have been made on the President and his Vietnam policy. I say let us support the President in his quest for peace. Americans must rally behind their President, for without the support of the

people no President can end the U.S. involvement in Vietnam with honor and retain the respect and regard of other Nations.

Join with me. Let us not turn our backs on freedom. Let us achieve peace with honor—a peace that will thwart the continued Communist attempt to poach on freedom's shrinking preserve. Setting a date for unilateral American withdrawal can only reduce Hanoi's incentive to negotiate and lengthen the time it takes to achieve a real peace. This is especially true as South Vietnam this year prepares to hold its second round of national elections from the Presidency to the village, beginning in May and ending in October. It is no mere coincidence that Hanoi asks America to set a withdrawal date to disrupt this process.

As I mentioned earlier, President Nixon has consistently wound down the war. He has cut our forces in Vietnam by more than half. He has also sliced our Vietnam war expenditures in two.

As we have wound down the war, the impact on our economy has been immense. We are presently in the midst of a transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

Just as President Nixon found the Vietnam War on the White House doorstep, so he also inherited an ongoing inflation and the seeds of even greater inflation.

In a speech delivered Nov. 10, 1969, former Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler acknowledged that inflation was flourishing when Mr. Nixon entered the White House. An inflationary spiral had been generated, he said, by "a steep advance in Government expenditures, coupled with sharp expansion of business spending on plant and equipment and of personal income."

During the two-year period between July 1, 1966 and June 30, 1968, Federal spending increased by \$44.1 billion, or 32.7 per cent. The timing and the nature of this sharp jump in Federal outlays built up inflationary pressures. This was a time when too many dollars were chasing too few goods—producing the classic demand-pull type of inflation.

During this same two-year period, Federal revenue failed to match Federal spending. To cover the deficit, the Government went into the money market to borrow \$25.9 billion. This created an acute credit shortage—and pushed up interest rates.

By 1969, when Richard Nixon took office, demand-pull inflation had already given way to another kind of inflation—cost-push.

The proof of this is that in 1968 output per man hour in manufacturing grew 4.7 per cent but wages per man-hour increased 7.1 per cent.

Due to the effects of inflation plus higher taxes, real spendable earnings as of Dec. 31, 1968, had dropped to \$103.99 a week. This constituted a 43-per cent decline in purchasing power over a three-year period. Labor then naturally set out to recapture this loss in real earnings.

The seeds of the slowdown in the economy were planted before Richard Nixon entered the White House.

On June 28, 1968, President Johnson signed a bill imposing a 10-per cent surtax on individual and corporate income and imposing a \$180.1 billion ceiling on fiscal year 1969 spending. This resulted in a \$28.1 billion turnaround in the Federal Government's fiscal stance—an abrupt change from stimulation to restraint. At the same time, the Federal Reserve Board was also pursuing a policy of restraint and continued it into 1969.

The Nixon Administration was forced to pay the price during 1969 and '70 for the inflationary binge of the late 1960's.

The price has been paid. We are now coming up on the plus side of the ledger.

The rise in prices that we experienced in 1969 and 1970 has been cut in half. During the first three months of 1971, prices rose at

an annual rate of 2.7 per cent—the lowest quarterly increase in four years and half the increase recorded last year.

The cost of borrowing money has dropped sharply. At the end of the first quarter of 1970, the prime interest rate had dropped to 5.5 per cent from 8 per cent in the first quarter of 1970 and from a high of 8.5 per cent in January 1969.

The Nation is now producing more than ever before. The Gross National Product increased by \$30.8 billion in the first quarter of 1971—the largest single absolute increase in our history. This doesn't quite fulfill the most optimistic forecasts but it is far better than was predicted by the pessimists.

A housing boom is under way. Toward the end of the first quarter of this year, the annual rate had gone above 1.9 million.

Consumer confidence is growing. Retail sales in the first quarter increased 3.3 per cent. Automobile sales set records.

Productivity is on the rise. After two years of virtually no growth, productivity increased 3.3 per cent during 1970. And in the first quarter of 1971, the rate increased 5.3 per cent. Although this reflects the rebound after last year's auto strike, it indicates that productivity is likely to rise more this year than last. This means a higher standard of living, with less inflationary pressure.

What all of this means is that the President is eminently right when he says we are bringing inflation under control, that 1971 will be a good year, and that 1972 will be better.

Earnings in the first quarter advanced by 8 per cent on a wide front. It's true that profits still are in a squeeze. But even without figuring in General Motors, profits were 4 per cent ahead of a year ago. So the picture is that profits are bouncing back.

The recovery is accelerating. There is underlying strength in the economy. Inflation is coming under control.

We can all look forward to better times ahead. And on that note I leave you.

#### THE REVOLUTION OF AGING

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, in Four Quartets, T. S. Eliot wrote:

Old men ought to be explorers. Here and there does not matter. We must be still and still moving into another intensity for a further union, a deeper communion.

Older Americans can and must be allowed to contribute, to participate, to "explore"—that is what Eliot was trying to tell us. Yet all too often these men and women have been denied a meaningful role in the affairs of our Nation merely because of age. We, as a society, have arbitrarily judged that older persons have outlived their usefulness and are no longer able to contribute and participate. This is, perhaps, the most tragic form of discrimination, for it seeks to deny these people a reason for living. Fortunately for all of us, millions of our older citizens are now refusing to accept such degradation and are seeking to change the institutions which perpetuate it.

Amid the clamor of America's young people for revolutionary changes in our society, there is another revolution taking place. It is quieter and often goes unnoticed, but it is happening right now throughout America. And it is the work of Americans who have probably expe-

rienced—and caused—more changes than today's young people can comprehend.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the 20 million Americans 65 years of age and older who have helped make this Nation what it is today. In every field, at every level of society, these men and women have wrought the changes which turned this Nation from an adolescent in the world community to the most powerful, complex, and industrialized country on the globe. They have developed all the wondrous machines, materials, and systems that are an indispensable part of modern life.

And today, they have accepted a new challenge. They are engaged in a quiet revolution to change their image and role in American life. Retired Americans are refusing to yield their places in the mainstream of our society; they are revolting against the institutions and attitudes which deny them opportunities to use their energies and talents as full participants in our national life.

Through such organizations as the Gerontological Society, the American Association of Retired Persons, and the National Retired Teachers Association—with over 2.5 million members and growing at the rate of nearly 1,600 new members daily—they are making their voices heard in local, State, and National legislative councils and are demonstrating their abilities in a host of community and national service programs. Above all, they are disproving the myth that the ability to contribute meaningfully to our society declines with age.

Mr. Speaker, May is Senior Citizens' Month. It is an appropriate time to examine the overwhelming historical evidence that creativity and contribution cannot be measured in terms of hours or days or be forced to retire at age 65 or any other arbitrary age.

This is a time for us once more to dedicate ourselves to the theme of this year's Senior Citizens' Month, "Toward a National Policy on Aging." For indeed we owe older Americans a policy which would assure them security and dignity, respect and the opportunity to contribute to the life of the whole community. Adequate nutrition and appropriate social services should be part of such a policy. So should such programs as the retired senior volunteers program—RSVP—which encourages our aging to spend time as volunteers with institutionalized youngsters.

Mr. Speaker, such a policy should provide more opportunities for part-time jobs for the aging, and it should assure them of recognition for the services they perform. For indeed Senior Citizens' Month is a time to recognize the revolutionary exploration of the frontier of retirement living by America's older citizens—demonstrating that retirement from work need not, and must not, mean withdrawal from life.

For retirement is not an end, it is a beginning. As T. S. Eliot said:

We shall not cease from exploration, and the end of all our exploring will be to arrive where we started and to know the place for the first time.

Let us resolve, therefore, to lower the barriers to such exploration and to allow our older citizens to contribute fully to the betterment of our society.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMÁS, FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING, BUSINESS COMMITTEE OF THE ARTS, NEW YORK, N.Y., MAY 17, 1971

(Mr. BRADEMÁS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, on May 17, I had the privilege of delivering an address at the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Business Committee for the Arts, at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City.

The Business Committee for the Arts is composed of some of the Nation's leading figures in business and industry who have made a commitment, on behalf of themselves and the corporations they represent, to support the arts.

As chairman of the Select Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, with jurisdiction over the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, I am pleased to commend the Business Committee for the Arts; its chairman, Robert O. Anderson, president of Atlantic-Richfield; and its president, G. A. McLellan, for the outstanding leadership they are giving to this important aspect of our Nation's life.

Mr. Speaker, I was also pleased on this occasion to join my distinguished colleague, Senator CHARLES H. PERCY, of Illinois, in urging members of the BCA to give their support to President Nixon's budget request of the full \$60 million authorized by Congress for the National Arts and Humanities Endowment for the fiscal year starting July 1, 1971.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the text of my remarks on this occasion:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMÁS

I am honored to be with you of the Business Committee for the Arts and especially pleased to be in this splendid institution in the life of our land—the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

I have been invited to address you, as among the nation's top leaders in business and industry, not because I am a businessman, for I am not, but because I am a politician who shares with you a concern for the vitality of the arts in our society.

As you know, the education subcommittee I have the honor to chair has jurisdiction over the programs of the National Arts and Humanities Foundation—but I must tell you that my subcommittee handles a variety of other legislative areas as well.

We also write bills touching on educational technology, child day care and preschool programs, drug abuse education, educational research, public libraries, education of the handicapped, and the older Americans programs.

And it has been enormously fascinating to me to see the ways in which what we do in one area dovetails with our legislative activities in other.

So it will not perhaps surprise you when I

tell you that last year, when several of my colleagues and I decided to write legislation providing funds for elementary and secondary schools for offering courses about the environment, I picked up the phone in Washington and called Robert Motherwell to ask him to be a witness on the first day of our hearings.

He said, "Why do you want me to testify on environmental education; I'm a painter."

I said, "Because we want to establish at the outset that in discussing the environmental crisis, we are talking about far more than clean air, land and water. We are talking about the fundamental values of human life."

Motherwell said, "I'll come," and his eloquent testimony that day provides the text for my sermon to you here.

TO SPEAK AS AN ARTIST IS NO SMALL THING

Said Motherwell, "I speak only as an artist, but to speak as an artist is no small thing. Most people ignorantly suppose that artists are the decorators of our human existence, the esthetes to whom the cultivated may turn when the real business of the day is done. But actually what an artist is, is a person skilled in expressing human feeling."

Motherwell went on to demonstrate his own skill in expressing human feeling when he voiced his horror at what we have made of much of our environment:

"One's mind reels at what men without an aesthetic sensibility have been capable of. Far from being merely decorative, the artist's awareness, with his sense of proportion and harmony, is one of the few guardians of the inherent sanity and equilibrium of the human spirit that we have."

It is to help assure that we do not lose the efforts of these guardians of sanity and the human spirit that we are meeting here today.

And to say this is in no way to derogate from the more worldly aspects of the arts. Richard Eels spoke well in his book *The Corporation and The Arts* when he said this:

"The arts are closely akin to the more obviously business-centered activities of corporate enterprises, mainly because they depend upon the quality of the human mind and personality that also produce the innovations without which business stagnates."

Or as Dr. Frank Stanton, the President of CBS, speaking, with admirable bluntness, told my education subcommittee:

"Business support of artists and art organizations can help to preserve the resources of talent and creativity on which, in the last analysis, it depends for its business needs."

Yet the activities through which artists live and communicate tend to be left behind by our society. The dance and music, opera, drama, sculpture and the new realms of multi-media work tend to miss out in the progress of our economy.

ON THE ECONOMICS OF THE ARTS

A brief descent into economics will indicate why this is so.

First, the arts are labor-intensive. A sculptor's time and thought and imagination are the main ingredients in his work, and no breakthroughs in the price of rock will make his output cheaper or more efficient.

Clive Barnes, of the New York Times, has said that in the dance, one of the arts in which America is clearly ceded international leadership, world acclaimed figures may earn as little as \$5,600 a year. Juniors in a major company may take home only \$4,200. Yet even on these wages the pay of dancers will make up 30% to half of a company's budget.

The same kind of situation confronts the treasurer of every symphony and opera company.

But while labor intensive, the arts are not amenable to increases in productivity. A 45-minute Schubert string quartet still takes

three man-hours to play, someone recently observed, the same as it did 150 years ago.

Finally, the arts can rarely take advantage of the economies of scale. There is a size beyond which no auditorium can convey the experience of opera or theater.

While modern techniques of reproduction can to some extent take painting to wider audiences, graphic art remains intimate and personal, not something to be appreciated by vast audiences at once.

Thus even without inflation, the economic structure of the arts is such that their costs would stay constant while increasing productivity in other fields made the price of enjoying them seem high. So in a dynamic or inflationary economy, inflation strikes hardest at the arts, ever widening the gap between costs and income.

Typically, according to Amyas Ames, the cost of operating any enterprise in the arts rises by about 10% a year. For a \$40 million operation like the Lincoln Center this means expenses this year will be \$4 million more than last. Even on a smaller budgetary base, such a proportionate increase is hard to bear in El Paso or Indianapolis.

While statisticians can have a field day estimating what goes into expenditure on the arts nationwide, a conservative estimate of \$2 billion a year suggests that the climb in expenses every year must reach a frightening \$200 million without the provision of any new performances.

And we know that new performances must be added in all the arts to meet the demands of increasing leisure, the desire for the arts in education, and to meet the need for cultural expression among America's minority groups.

Indeed, I might take advantage of this forum to tell you that my friend and distinguished colleague, and the ranking minority member of my subcommittee, Congressman Ogden Reid of New York, and I have tentatively decided to bring our subcommittee to New York City sometime late this year or in the Spring of 1972 to spend several days touring institutions of art in this city—big institutions and small ones, established ones and experimental ones—in order to learn as much as we can about the situation of the arts in this capital of the arts and in order as well to dramatize to the general public the rising awareness in Congress of the role of the arts in the American Society.

But what else is to be done to focus attention on the economic plight of the arts?

#### THE ROLE OF BUSINESS

The formation of your Business Committee for the Arts three years ago is a most hopeful sign. Indeed, the cash contribution of American corporations to the arts was about \$100 million last year, an indispensable part of the solution to the problem. It is encouraging as well, as this week's issue of *Business Week* points out, to see how more and more companies are lending their expertise to artists and institutions that need it.

And the Affiliate Art Program of the Sears Roebuck Foundation, the contributions of expensive advertising space made by *Newsweek*, the fellowships and scholarships given to promising young artists by many of your companies—all of these actions constitute support of the arts which no other segment of society can match.

So you in this room represent a force of immense importance to the arts in American life.

The work of the Business Committee for the Arts in encouraging such support of the arts among your fellow businessmen is a profound service to our country, and one to which I, as a Member of Congress with legislative responsibility for the arts, am glad to pay warm tribute, and I here express a special word of thanks to your distinguished Chair-

man, Robert O. Anderson, and your indefatigable President, G. A. McLellan for their splendid leadership.

So I hope that you will continue and indeed, expand, your efforts through the seventies.

#### MORE THAN MONEY AND EXPERTISE

But business has a role to play in supporting the arts that goes beyond contributions of money and expert counsel.

We have in recent years come more and more to realize that it is both appropriate and wise for government to lend its support to the arts.

We no longer bridle at the suggestion that it is improper to earmark a modest fraction of our tax dollars to help the arts.

The establishment of the National Arts and Humanities Foundation in 1965 is, of course, the most obvious expression of that commitment on the part of the Federal government.

Here in New York, under the leadership of Governor Rockefeller, your state has pioneered the way for state governments to follow in helping the arts.

But your recent battle to save some \$15 million for your state Arts Council dramatizes the further responsibility of the business community to the arts.

For just as business and other leaders here mobilized to stimulate an avalanche of mail to Albany, so, too, we in Washington who support an adequate appropriation for the arts need your help.

I would like, in this respect, to pay tribute to Amyas Ames for starting the nationwide Partnership for the Arts, which, as part of its goal of \$200 million annual government support for the arts, is now campaigning for full funding of the \$30 million which Congress authorized for the National Arts Foundation for the next fiscal year.

Now, as some of you may know, I am a Democrat, and I find little difficulty in restraining my enthusiasm for the works of this Administration.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON'S SUPPORT OF THE ARTS

But, I am pleased indeed to praise President Nixon for his budget request of the full \$60 million Congress authorized for the Arts and Humanities Foundation—\$30 million for each.

I am glad also to pay tribute to my friend, Nancy Hanks, for her effective leadership at the National Arts Endowment.

This goal of \$30 million for the Arts Endowment is one which should also command your support.

But it is a goal more likely to be reached with the aid of members of the Business Committee for the Arts.

And I think that achieving full funding affords a splendid opportunity for a new coalition between business and government in support of the arts.

For the members of the Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee will shortly be considering the appropriation for the Arts and Humanities Foundation for fiscal 1972, and they are likely to be well-disposed toward the proposal for full funding for the Foundation. That is even more likely to happen if they know that the kinds of persons represented by the members of your Committee support that principle.

The able Chairwoman of that Subcommittee is Mrs. Julia Butler Hansen of the State of Washington, and her colleagues are as follows: Democrats John H. Flynt of Georgia, David R. Obey of Wisconsin, Sidney R. Yates of Illinois, and Nick Galifianakis of North Carolina.

The Republicans are Joseph M. McDade of Pennsylvania, Wendell Wyatt of Oregon and Del Clawson of California.

Every one of these outstanding legislators would value the counsel of men and women like yourselves, and I hope therefore that you

will communicate soon with them and with your own Senators and Representatives to support full funding of the Foundation for the Arts and Humanities. In doing so, your Committee will be multiplying the effectiveness of your own contributions of money and time.

I believe it important that the goal of full funding be reached, not only because the money can be put to good use for the arts across the country, but also because it is the necessary groundwork for the more ambitious objective of annually committing about one Federal dollar per capita for the arts in America.

#### TWO KINDS OF BALANCE

At such a level of support, we would begin to see two kinds of balance at present lacking in our public standing toward the arts.

We would be starting to redress the imbalance between the arts and humanities, on the one hand, and the hard sciences, on the other.

And we would come closer to achieving balance in financing between business and boxoffice receipts, on the one hand, and the public purse, on the other—a balance essential to the preservation of the vitality and independence of the arts.

W. McNeil Lowry, of the Ford Foundation, who, as you all know, has given extraordinary leadership to the arts, has been particularly thoughtful about these issues of balance, so I think it appropriate that I share with you his concluding remarks before my subcommittee last year.

Educators and scholars generally in the United States believe very strongly in the diversity of public and private activities in the support of the humanities and other areas of knowledge. But there is a special significance in such support, I believe, when it is awarded by the government and people of the United States, through the Congress and the President. Such support signifies that the advancement of learning, the preservation of knowledge and the cultivation of humane values are policies and goals of the entire society.

In the contest over national priorities, both the humanities and the arts in the long history of the Republic have by the people's representatives but recently been given even token recognition. However narrow, the way has nevertheless been opened.

At a time when the Congress and the people grapple with the more and more complex fruits of materialism and technology, the government's recognition of fundamental questions of value and creativity has surely a special importance.

I concur in that judgment, and it is clear to me that you of the Business Committee for the Arts do, too, and that is why I am confident that there will indeed be a new coalition of business and government working together for greater support of the arts in our country.

For to return to the text of my sermon, "To speak as an artist is no small thing."

"BUSINESS UNIT FOR ARTS PLANS TO WIDEN ITS ROLE," AN ARTICLE BY HOWARD TAUBMAN, NEW YORK TIMES, MAY 19, 1971

Mr. Speaker, I also insert in the RECORD an article by Howard Taubman of the New York Times on May 19, 1971, concerning the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Business Committee of the Arts:

BUSINESS UNIT FOR ARTS PLANS TO WIDEN ITS ROLE

(By Howard Taubman)

When the Business Committee for the Arts was formed about four years ago by more than 100 chief executives of major American corporations, it assumed it would be self-liquidating as soon as its mission of educating corporations to support the arts was accomplished. But at the fourth annual meet-

ing of the committee at the Metropolitan Museum of Art on Monday it became clear that the committee was preparing to broaden its role and stay in business indefinitely.

The challenge for the future was expressed by Robert O. Anderson, chairman of the committee and chairman of the Atlantic Richfield Company, when he said:

"Do we have a broader role to play than originally contemplated? We have had a good deal of success in changing corporate attitudes, but we must do some thinking about the future."

A forward-looking corporation, he said, is marked by its ability to attract the country's ablest young people into its service, and such young people today judge a company by its awareness and responsiveness to the arts.

#### COALITION FOR FUTURE

Representative John Brademas, Democrat of Indiana, chairman of the Select Education subcommittee that clears legislation involving Federal support of the arts and humanities, offered committee members a specific goal for the future—"a new coalition between business and Government in support of the arts."

Mr. Brademas stressed the need of business support of President Nixon's request for full funding of \$60-million for the arts and humanities for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. He called this "the necessary groundwork for the more ambitious objective of committing about one Federal dollar per capita for the arts in America."

At a \$200-million annual level, Mr. Brademas continued, "we would begin to see two kinds of balance at present lacking in our public posture toward the arts": redressing the imbalance between the arts and humanities on the one hand and the hard sciences on the other and coming closer to achieving a balance in financing between business and box-office receipts on the one hand and the public purse on the other.

Senator Charles M. Percy, Republican of Illinois, addressing committee members and their guests at a formal dinner in the elegant Medieval Sculpture Hall of the museum, not only endorsed Representative Brademas' ideas for Federal and business cooperation in support of the arts but also urged a fresh look at the Government's tax legislation touching on foundations.

He charged that the most recent tax reform act including punitive measures against foundations, such as an annual direct tax of 2 per cent. Even with increasing Federal support, the arts require private and foundation support, and therefore, he said, "let's take the tax off."

Robert J. Buzbee, speaking for Sears, Roebuck, showed a film, about 30 minutes in length, produced by the Sears-Roebuck Foundation for the Associated Councils of the Arts. Written and directed by Julian Krainin and DeWitt L. Sage Jr. and produced under the supervision of Henry Strauss, this film, "Art Is" . . . assembles sights and sounds that brilliantly illustrate the diversity of art and its sources and the infinity of meaning and feeling it can provide to beginners as well as sophisticates.

#### REORGANIZATION OF THE LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to the recent statement of Administrator Jerris Leonard concerning the operations and organization of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Mr. Leonard

has admitted weaknesses in the administration of the program and has promised that the deficiencies will be corrected in the next few months.

Mr. Leonard is to be commended for his frankness and for his promise of reforms and I sincerely hope that the necessary improvements will be undertaken so that efficient operation of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration will be assured.

Certainly, the achievement of effective law enforcement must be one of the principal objectives of our Government. At the same time, especially in law enforcement, there is no justification for inefficiency or waste, and the Congress will continue to survey this program with the objective of eliminating these elements.

Enough evidence has come to light to indicate that what Mr. Leonard calls a "nationwide crime control program" is a euphemism as applied in certain States and that lack of precise guidelines for expenditures and vague definitions of jurisdiction and objectives have caused money to be used for purposes which could not under the broadest interpretation be considered law enforcement. It is urgent that the sprawling activities under this broad umbrella be efficiency organized and coordinated, and it is vital that the extensive spending be related to the intent of Congress when the authorizing law was passed.

I trust that Mr. Leonard will be able to achieve this objective, but I can guarantee that Congress will be watching carefully to make sure that the operations of LEAA demonstrate the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness which the public welfare requires.

#### PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing my proposal to shorten presidential campaigns by making illegal the nomination of presidential candidates more than 60 days prior to election day.

Few would deny that our presidential campaigns have gotten out of hand, and are in need of some form of regulation. Campaign excesses are numerous and varied, yet in most cases can be directly related to the length which we allow campaigns to run. Campaign spending, for instance, a problem the Congress is presently trying to deal with, has grown historically in conjunction with campaign length. In 1860, Abraham Lincoln won the Presidency with no campaigning, and the two major parties together spent a grand total of \$160,000. A century later, John Kennedy traveled 40,000 miles to deliver 360 speeches, and the two major parties spent some \$20 million to elect their candidates.

Besides the actual cost of long campaigns, such marathons eventually turn off the electorate. Flooded with leaflets, newspaper advertisements, and more recently with television commercials, the voters quickly reach their saturation

point. One cannot and should not expect a voter to concentrate on candidates and issues for over a year of primary activity, and then for a 4-month presidential campaign. In our age of mass media, such a time excess is unnecessary, and simply leads to disinterest. The fault lies not in the voters or in the candidates. It lies in a system which allows a campaign to reach the point where it deadens the senses and exhausts the intellect. As a result, any discussion of issues falls on dead ears.

Candidates themselves must be iron men or drop out of the presidential sweepstakes. At one point in our history, presidential candidates did no campaigning whatsoever lest they be considered undignified. Today, we must witness exhausted candidates make embarrassing slips and sometimes be pressed into positions unrepresentative of their real thinking. The purpose of any campaigning should be public enlightenment. The lengthy and tedious overexposure of our presidential timber only runs counter to this goal.

For some years I have attempted through legislation to limit the length of presidential campaigns to 60 days. I am reintroducing this proposal today in hopes that the Congress will consider this essential reform in its deliberation over other campaign excesses. The precedents for such a proposal are many. England, Canada, and Israel, among others, all manage to conduct their campaigns in about a month, with no adverse effects upon the electoral process. There is no reason why the United States cannot exercise the same commonsense.

There is, of course, no special magic to the No. 60. It is simply a reasonable and adequate period of time for voters and candidates to communicate. In our age of television, there is no need for candidates to exhaust themselves and their finances through many months of presidential politics to reach the voters. The mass media have made the long campaign obsolete and the short campaign a necessity.

It is obvious that there are many ways in which our campaigns can be made more effective, and I am hopeful that Congress will pass a comprehensive reform bill during this session. However, I believe that the principal place to attack many of our campaign abuses is the length of campaigns. In shortening our presidential campaigns, the Congress will automatically reduce and possibly eliminate other objectionable campaign excesses which are so intimately related to campaign length. In its present consideration of spending limits and other campaign reforms, I hope the Congress will not omit consideration of this major electoral problem. The short campaign makes sense physically, financially, and psychologically, and should be included in any reform package enacted by the Congress.

#### THE NEW REVOLUTION IS HERE: PROGRESS HAS BEEN REVERSED

(Mr. MELCHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MELCHER. On Friday morning, May 14, I received a copy of the Great Falls Tribune through the mails in my office which had been printed late May 1 for circulation Sunday, May 2. It had been en route to my office 12 or 13 days—at least four times as long as it took the Tribune to reach me a few months ago.

Each new administration has its campaign slogan. New Deal, Fair Deal, New Frontier all had their day in the sun. The present administration spoke of a revolution when it took office, and we are getting it. Between the new Postal Service Corporation and Amtrak we have a full fledged revolt under way against modern efficiency. Given time, I am sure that all the progress of the last half century can be overcome. We already have progress shifted into reverse gear; it is only a matter of gathering speed now.

I am really cheating when I use the Great Falls Tribune as my example of the success of new revolution.

In all fairness, I think I should report that my home town newspaper, the Forsyth, Mont., Independent, for April 29—published 15 days earlier—along with the Miles City Star for that same date, arrived in my office in the same May 14 mail as the Great Falls Tribune for May 2. They took 17 days to get to Washington, actually 5 days longer than the Tribune—a considerably more revolutionary record.

I realize now why we are expediting a bill to protect the Nation's wild horses.

Given another month or two of the revolution and we will be ready for reestablishment of the Pony Express. I am not at all sure that this will be done. My best calculations are that the Pony Express could get newspapers from Montana to Washington in less than a week, and the current methods of delivery have that beat by 5 to 10 days—5 to 10 days longer than a week, that is.

Mr. Speaker, my astonishment at the revolution we are having is simply beyond my ability to express.

Amtrak has stopped most of our railroad passenger service.

The new Postal Corporation has all but stopped our mail.

The Interior Department is getting ready to celebrate Yellowstone National Park's centennial birthday somewhere else—they have the park in such a shape it cannot handle its own birthday party and those of us who want to better the funding and planning are standing alone. There is no plan I can discover to get the park in shape for its 1972 celebration.

On the campaign trail, the President told farmers in September 1968 that 74 percent of parity was "intolerable"—and, sure enough, that is changed too.

Farmers only get 69 percent of parity these days.

The revolution is here, indeed.

The fact that it is not the kind of revolution many of our citizens anticipated will prove disturbing to a great many people, I am sure.

But a revolution there is.

The pledge to bring about one is being kept.

Different officials of the cabinet have segments of the revolution to handle.

Secretary Volpe has discontinued the trains and is currently tampering with the trucking industry use of anyone under 21 years of age as drivers—including even family farmers whose young sons have a much better than average safety record as truck drivers. He may yet get farm and ranch commodity transportation in a mess, as well as train passenger service. Mr. Blount, who forbids all his post office employees talking to Members of Congress for increasingly obvious reasons, has the mail in an unprecedented bind. And Secretary Hardin, who is dealing with the "intolerable 74 percent of parity," and who finds himself between a rock and a hard spot trying to explain his accomplishments to farmers, has nonetheless achieved revolutionary results—in reverse.

Their achievements as "new revolutionaries" should undoubtedly get recognition. They are outstanding in the same sort of way as Reigels famous football dash in the wrong direction.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the previous order of the House, the Chair declares a recess subject to the call of the Chair. The bells will be rung 15 minutes prior to the House reconvening.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 8190, SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. MAHON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 8190) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 92-221)

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8190) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 8, 21, 22, 23, 25, 34, 36, 40, 42, 43, 47, 50, 53, 54, 60, 65, and 74.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 24, 27, 28, 30, 32, 33, 35, 44, 45, 48, 51, 52, 55, 56, 58, 61, 66, 67, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, and 83, and agree to the same.

Amendment No. 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$105,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of

the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 4, 18, 26, 29, 37, 38, 39, 41, 46, 49, 57, 59, 62, 64, 69, and 84.

GEORGE MAHON,  
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,  
GEORGE W. ANDREWS,  
JOHN J. ROONEY,  
OTTO E. PASSMAN,  
EDWARD P. BOLAND (except as to No. 57),  
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,  
DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
TOM STEED (except as to No. 57),  
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,  
JOHN J. McFALL,  
FRANK T. BOW,  
CHARLES R. JONAS,  
ELFORD A. CEDERBERG,  
JOHN J. RHODES,  
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,  
SILVIO CONTE,  
GLENN R. DAVIS,

#### Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
JOHN O. PASTORE,  
ALAN BIBLE,  
ROBERT BYRD,  
GALE W. MCGEE,  
WILLIAM PROXMIER,  
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,  
DANIEL K. INOUYE,  
MILTON R. YOUNG,  
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,  
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,  
GORDON ALLOTT,

#### Managers on the Part of the Senate.

#### JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8190) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

#### CHAPTER I—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2: Appropriate \$1,000,000 to be used for accelerated corn blight research by the Cooperative State Research Service as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,000,000 for a similar program by the Agricultural Research Service as proposed by the House. A motion will be offered by the managers on the part of the House which will delete the item of \$25,000 added by the Senate for cooperative research on sweet potato weevil in view of the imminent consideration of the 1972 appropriation bill. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate in respect to amendment No. 2.

Amendment No. 3: Restores the following language deleted by the Senate: "of which \$35,000,000 shall be available for the approximately 147 counties which have been duly qualified but have not been included in the Food Stamp Program".

The managers recognize that it will take time to train people, certify grocers, and take the other necessary actions preliminary to providing food stamps in these 147 counties on the same basis as in the counties now in the program. Such necessary actions might well take until July 1. In the meantime the total funds under such language is available for the overall program.

Amendment No. 4: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to provide \$65,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the emergency credit revolving fund due to the depletion of the fund by higher than anticipated emergency situations. This amendment was submitted to the Congress too late to be considered by the House.

#### CHAPTER III—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

##### Federal funds

Amendments Nos. 5, 6, and 7: Insert chapter number and title and appropriate \$22,206,000 for "Federal payment to the District of Columbia," as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Deletes the appropriation of \$34,178,000 for "Loans to the District of Columbia for capital outlay" proposed by the Senate.

##### District of Columbia funds

Amendment No. 9: Inserts heading, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates \$2,557,035 for "General operating expenses" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$2,806,000 for "Public safety" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$2,939,800 for "Education" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$61,000 for "Recreation" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$4,512,000 for "Human resources" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates \$525,000 for "Highways and traffic" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates \$132,500 for "Sanitary Engineering" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$35,409 for "Settlement of claims and suits" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment appropriating \$2,988,393 for "Capital outlay" instead of \$37,166,393 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

With the exception of the subway, all capital outlay projects proposed by the Senate have been allowed.

The appropriation of \$34,178,000 included by the Senate for the District of Columbia's share of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority's 1971 construction program has been deleted. The conferees are agreed without question that there is a need for a balanced system of transportation in the Nation's Capital. Since the action of the House denying the \$34,178,000, the Secretary of Transportation now says that immediate action will be taken to comply with the 1970 Highway Act and that there will be compliance with the Highway Acts of 1968 and 1970. This action will place the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate in a position to approve the request in the Supplemental bill of \$34,178,000 along with the \$38,808,000 requested for fiscal year 1972 in the regular District of Columbia Appropriation Bill for 1972.

Amendment No. 19: Inserts language relating to division of expenses as proposed by the Senate.

#### CHAPTER IV—FOREIGN OPERATIONS

Amendment No. 20: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 21: Restores language

proposed by the House and deleted by the Senate, and deletes language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Restores language proposed by the House and deleted by the Senate concerning the payment of a portion of the installment for the United States share of the increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates \$275,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$387,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The managers agree that the funds appropriated under this section should be allocated as follows: \$25,000,000 for paid-in ordinary capital, \$200,000,000 for callable ordinary capital, and \$50,000,000 for the Fund for Special Operations.

#### CHAPTER V—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Amendment No. 24: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 25: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to provide an additional \$25,000,000 annual contract authority for the Homeownership (Sec. 235) and \$25,000,000 for the Rental housing (Sec. 236) assistance programs.

Amendment No. 26: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to clarify the intent of Congress in the use of \$10 million provided in 1971 to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for use at the Mississippi Test Facility/Slidell Computer Complex to accommodate earth environmental studies, and extend the time for obligation of such funds to September 30, 1971.

Amendment No. 27: Inserts center headings and appropriates \$84,000 for Salaries and expenses, Securities and Exchange Commission, as proposed by the Senate.

#### CHAPTER VI—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Amendment No. 28: Changes chapter number as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate to appropriate \$750,000 for Geological Survey, "Surveys, Investigations, and Research."

#### CHAPTER VII—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

##### Manpower Administration

Amendment No. 30: Changes chapter number as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates \$105,000,000 for "Manpower training activities" for the 1971 summer youth program, instead of \$100,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$116,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

##### Labor-Management Services Administration

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates \$500,000 for "Salaries and expenses," as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$750,000, as proposed by the House.

##### Wage and Labor Standards Administration

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates \$1,400,000 for "Salaries and expenses" for carrying out the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, as proposed by the Senate.

#### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

##### Environmental Health Service

Amendment No. 34: Deletes appropriation of \$5,000,000 for "Environmental control" for a grant program authorized by the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, proposed by the Senate.

##### Health Services and Mental Health Administration

Amendment No. 35: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36: Delete appropriation of \$20,000,000 for "Mental Health" for prevention and treatment of alcoholism proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which appropriates \$3,000,000 for "Comprehensive health planning and services" to carry out the Emergency Health Personnel Act of 1970.

Amendment No. 38: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment to appropriate \$6 million for "Maternal and Child Health" for family planning services, instead of \$10 million, as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which appropriates \$10,000,000 for "Regional medical programs." The managers are agreed that none of these funds are earmarked for programs dealing with any particular disease.

##### National Institutes of Health

Amendment No. 40: Strikes appropriation of \$5,000,000 for "National Institute of Child Health and Human Development" for additional family planning research proposed by the Senate.

##### Social and Rehabilitation Service

##### Grants to States for Public Assistance

Amendment No. 41: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which inserts language to exempt grants to Puerto Rico from the special limitation of \$21,000,000 contained in the Social Security Act. This will allow the continued payment of the Federal share of 50% of welfare payments estimated to total \$23,700,000. The unusually high level is occasioned by the floods of last October.

Amendment No. 42: Strikes appropriation of \$1,700,000 for "Programs for the Aging" proposed by the Senate.

##### Departmental Management

Amendment No. 43: Restores appropriation of \$2,000,000 for "Departmental Management" for the Commission on Medical Malpractice proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

#### CHAPTER VIII—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Amendment No. 44: Changes chapter number as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment providing a gratuity to the heirs of a deceased Senator.

Amendment No. 47: Deletes the proposal of the Senate authorizing the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate to appoint and fix the compensation of six guides until such time as appropriations for the Capitol Guide Service become available.

Amendment No. 48: Appropriates \$105,000 for "Contingent Expenses of the Senate, Miscellaneous Items" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to restore the language stricken by the Senate with an amendment to make the appropriation of \$500,000 for the Joint Economic Committee

available until June 30, 1973. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 50: Deletes proposal of the Senate relating to overtime compensation for Capitol Police.

The Senate amendment proposed to pay each member of the Capitol Police overtime pay at a rate equal to his hourly rate of compensation for overtime performed during the period between March 1 and June 30, 1971. The Senate amendment proposed disbursement for those members and officers on the Senate payroll from the existing appropriation, Salaries, Officers and Employees, and for disbursement to those members and officers on the payroll of the House of Representatives from funds available to the Clerk of the House.

The managers on the part of the House and of the Senate understand that the Special Subcommittee on Police of the House Administration Committee has approved a House Resolution which includes a provision for overtime pay for Capitol Police, whose compensation is disbursed by the House of Representatives, for overtime performed during the period March 1 through June 30, 1971. The House Resolution, we understand, would provide time-and-a-half for sergeants, other officers at this level, and privates, and regular time for lieutenants and above.

The managers further understand that the House Resolution is slated to be considered for reporting to the House at an early date, and early consideration may be expected in the House of Representatives.

In the circumstances, the managers deemed it wise to await developments on the aforesaid House Resolution. It was the view of the managers that the Capitol Police were entitled to appropriate overtime compensation. The Legislative Branch Appropriation Bill will, as things now stand, be acted on in both bodies in June, and at that time the entire matter can be resolved so that the rates will be equal in the House of Representatives and the Senate, and will cover the retroactive period.

#### CHAPTER IX—PUBLIC WORKS

Amendment No. 51: Changes chapter number as proposed by the Senate.

#### CHAPTER X—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Amendment No. 52: Changes chapter number as proposed by the Senate.

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates \$130,000 for "Minority Business Enterprise, Salaries and Expenses" as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 54: Deletes proviso of the Senate relative to availability of certain funds for the Maritime Administration.

#### CHAPTER XI—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Amendment No. 55: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 56: Deletes item proposed by the House to appropriate \$85,330,000 for Civil Supersonic Aircraft Development.

Amendment No. 57: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment making the funds appropriated available for refund of amounts contributed by airlines toward the civil supersonic aircraft research and development program and permitting the funds to remain available until expended. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 58: Deletes item proposed by the House to appropriate \$3,000,000 for Construction, National Capital Airports.

Amendment No. 59: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment to appropriate \$2,800,000 for United States International Aeronautical Exposition instead of \$2,600,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 60: Limits obligations for Highway Beautification to \$10,000,000 instead of \$15,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61: Deletes the appropriation of \$80,000 for Territorial Highways as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 62: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to appropriate \$5,000,000 for Darien Gap Highway.

Amendment No. 63: Appropriates \$2,500,000 for Railroad Research instead of \$2,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 64: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to permit the funds appropriated to remain available until expended.

Amendment No. 65: Appropriates \$7,500,000 for Urban Mass Transportation Fund instead of \$15,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### CHAPTER XII—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 66: Changes chapter number.

#### Bureau of the Public Debt

Amendment No. 67: Appropriates \$800,000 for administering the public debt as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

#### Bureau of Accounts

Amendment No. 68: Appropriates \$3,750,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate.

#### Independent agencies

#### Commission on Government Procurement

Amendment No. 69: Reported in technical disagreement. The House managers will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which appropriates \$600,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate.

#### Claims and Judgments

Amendment No. 70: Changes chapter number.

#### TITLE II—INCREASED PAY COSTS

#### Executive Office of the President

Amendments Nos. 71 and 72: Appropriate additional pay act funds as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 73: Deletes the appropriation of \$28,000 for Salaries and expenses, Domestic Council, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 74: Deletes additional pay act funds proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 75: Appropriates \$5,220,000 for "Forest Roads and Trails (liquidation of contract authority)" as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,020,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 76-83: Appropriate additional pay act funds as proposed by the Senate.

#### TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 84: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment providing

for certain transfer authority among postal appropriations to meet pay costs.

GEORGE MAHON,  
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,  
GEORGE W. ANDREWS,  
JOHN J. ROONEY,  
OTTO E. PASSMAN,  
EDWARD P. BOLAND,  
(except as to number 57),  
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,  
DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
TOM STEED,  
(except as to number 57),  
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,  
JOHN J. McFALL,  
FRANK T. BOW,  
CHARLES R. JONAS,  
ELFORD A. CEDERBERG,  
JOHN J. RHODES,  
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,  
SILVIO O. CONTE,  
GLENN R. DAVIS,

#### Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
JOHN O. PASTORE,  
ALAN BIBLE,  
ROBERT C. BYRD,  
GALE W. MCGEE,  
WILLIAM PROXMIER,  
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,  
DANIEL K. INOUE,  
MILTON R. YOUNG,  
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,  
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,  
GORDON ALLOTT,

#### Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8190) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers 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 Texas? There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement. (For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of today.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the House passed the second supplemental bill principally to provide pay for employees of the Government. This was necessary because of pay increases that had been placed into effect in 1970 and 1971.

The bill totaled, when it passed the House, about \$6.3 billion. It was \$865 million below the budget because certain reductions were made especially in the foreign aid chapter. The bill went to the other body and additional budget estimates were submitted by the White House to the other body.

The conference report as it is presented to us today provides about \$7 billion.

There were 84 amendments adopted to the bill in the Senate and, of course, it took some time this afternoon to consider these amendments in conference and resolve the differences. Some of them were rather pro forma and some were very significant.

But, Mr. Speaker, the bill and conference report are now in proper form. They have been checked and double checked. That was one of the reasons why it was impossible to bring this matter before you

earlier. The figures and the language have to be not approximately correct, but absolutely correct.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good time to say that the professional staff people of this Congress are public servants of tremendous talent, experience, and dedication. They deserve much commendation. They do a magnificent job.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the most controversial item in the bill, of course, is the supersonic transport, the SST. The Senate struck out the funds for continuation of the SST and provided for the termination of the program. The Senate placed in the bill \$155.8 million for the termination of the program. So, in conference, the House had no alternative in view of the fact that the program was being canceled other than to provide cancellation costs.

We do not know exactly what the termination costs are going to be. The best estimate at this time is that the termination costs will be about \$155.8 million, but this is subject to negotiation by the Government and the contractors. So, we cannot arrive at a precise figure at this time. But let the RECORD show that this Congress does not want any termination cost to be paid that is not due in equity and in fairness in connection with this program.

The language as approved by the conferees reads as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
CIVIL SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT  
TERMINATION

For expenses necessary for the termination of the civil supersonic aircraft program, and for refund of amounts contributed by airlines toward the civil supersonic aircraft research and development program, \$155,800,000, to remain available until expended.

"For expenses necessary," and I underline the word "necessary." We could not determine precisely under the circumstances at this time what those expenses are precisely. But we say "for expenses necessary for the termination of the supersonic aircraft program, \$155.8 million."

Now, that was the most controversial item, of course, and the most emotionally charged item, I would say.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. It seems to me that it is not only a question of fair and equitable and reasonable settlement of the costs, but it is also a question of authorization for settlement of the costs.

Is the gentleman saying to the House that having virtually doubled what might be called indemnity to the airline companies and the aircraft manufacturing companies, that all of the settlements have already been authorized by law?

Mr. MAHON. The contracts were entered into between the Government and the companies. The contracts prescribe the procedures relating to termination.

I will yield to the chairman of the subcommittee handling the transportation item, the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL) for further comment.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add to the explanation which the Chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) has made that the request made by the Department of Transportation to terminate the SST program was for \$97 million, of which \$85 million was to go to GE and Boeing under the original contract providing for cancellation of the program, and \$12 million was necessary for auditing, and other matters for the determination of the amounts to be paid for the termination of the program. This was not included by the House committee, but was included by the Senate committee. It was requested, and it is part of the budget estimate requested by the administration. An additional \$58 million was added by the Senate last evening to go to the airlines for the amount of money which they put up as a part of the development costs of the program. This was not a part of the request made by the Department of Transportation, and as far as I know was not authorized by the contract, nor was it authorized by any law which we have passed. It would be authorized for payment by the language which the committee will propose, if the House and the Senate pass it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, if the House passes the conference report, and it is not challenged in any other way, then \$58.5 million will be expended on representations made by the airlines. Is that correct?

Mr. McFALL. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And without any authorization on the part of the Congress?

Mr. McFALL. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that the representation made by the airlines, which I agree with, is that the moral obligation of the Government is to repay the \$58 million to the airlines who put up these funds as a risk on the technology, but not as a risk on the Government terminating it in this way. I believe that they are entitled to have their money back.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on the technology question?

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. I would like to know what is going to happen to the engineering rights and patents rights to this aircraft? I have heard this afternoon from a source I believe to be very reliable that the Government will have no call on Boeing whatsoever should Boeing through other financing, possibly with a foreign government or commercial banks, produce this aircraft in a year or two years from now, and we will not receive any repayment for the money we have expended.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, my understanding of the contract is that all of the rights, all of the patents, and all the other matters of property which are part of the SST program, are now owned 90 percent by the Government and 10 percent by the contractors. Since Boeing and GE are the contractors, they own 10 percent, and we own 90 percent.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McFALL. Let me finish.

Without some sort of special authorization, I do not believe that anything should be done with them.

Whatever the price of financing this construction of the SST privately would be, they cannot finance it without paying the Government for giving them the millions of dollars of rights that we have developed.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Then it is the gentleman's statement unequivocally that we retain the rights we have in engineering drawings and the design of this aircraft and there is nothing in this agreement which in any way takes away the right of the U.S. Government if at some future date this aircraft is resurrected either by ourselves or by Boeing or by some foreign government.

Mr. McFALL. My unequivocal understanding is that we presently own 90 percent of it and after we pay back the contractors' cost shares we will own all of it. I feel that these rights should not be given away without some additional legislation passed by this House.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Does this legislation to that?

Mr. McFALL. No, it does not.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. YATES. It is my understanding with respect to the sum agreed upon by the conferees which includes payment to the airlines that the conferees have brought that back in technical disagreement and that there will be a separate vote on it.

Mr. MAHON. It is brought back in technical disagreement. This is in accordance with the rules of the House. The conferees are actually in agreement but it is necessary that we bring this item back outside of the conference report. At the appropriate time I will offer a motion that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. YATES. And there may be a separate vote on it?

Mr. MAHON. Yes, there may be a separate vote.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. LONG of Maryland. Would it be fair to say that the end of the SST comes not with a bang but with a whimper?

Mr. MAHON. The end has come. I think there is no doubt about that.

Mr. Speaker, I will say that another item of interest in the conference report is the item for summer jobs. The President asked for \$64 million. The House increased this amount to \$100 million, realizing the importance of the program and the interest of the Members in the program. The other body increased the amount to \$116 million. In conference \$105 million was agreed upon.

Another item, Mr. Speaker, is the District of Columbia subway which has been a bit controversial.

Mr. Speaker, I will yield to my friend, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr.

NATCHER) to make it crystal clear what was done with regard to the District of Columbia subway.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in over a year the Department of Transportation and the District of Columbia officials, in my opinion, are making a sincere effort to carry out the Highway Act of 1970 and the Highway Act of 1968.

In the conference today, the \$34,178,000 for rapid rail transit was deleted.

We have a statement in the conference report of the managers on the part of the House and the Senate and I would like to read this to the Members at this time.

The language that is in this statement accompanying the conference report reads as follows:

The appropriation of \$34,178,000 included by the Senate for the District of Columbia's share of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority's 1971 construction program has been deleted. The conferees are agreed without question that there is a need for a balanced system of transportation in the Nation's Capital. Since the action of the House denying the \$34,178,000 the Secretary of Transportation now says that immediate action will be taken to comply with the 1970 Highway Act and that there will be compliance with the Highway Acts of 1968 and 1970. This action will place the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate in a position to approve the request in the Supplemental bill of \$34,178,000 along with the \$38,308,000 requested for fiscal year 1972 in the regular District of Columbia Appropriation bill for 1972.

Mr. Speaker, as you well know, within the next few weeks hearings will begin on the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1972. Our committee wants to be in a position to bring back to this House a bill containing not only the \$38,308,000 in the regular bill but also the \$34,178,000 in the supplemental request.

As Members know, our committee recommended the money that started the rapid rail transit system. Over the last 12 years we have recommended and the House has approved, over \$200 million for our freeway system.

Mr. Speaker, for a period of over 1 year construction was underway on the Three Sisters Bridge. Construction began in August of 1969 and continued until August of 1970. Today the contractor is receiving \$500 per day and each month \$30,000. Under the order of the court, work on the bridge was delayed in order that a design hearing could be held. The design hearing was held and completed on December 13 of last year.

In addition to that, someone thought of the idea that they should have an 81-foot model. I understand that several days ago the company manufacturing this model broke it.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important matter from the standpoint of rapid rail transit. A bill is now being prepared, which will be brought to this House and to the other body, which would increase the overall cost at this time to \$2,980,200,000 for rapid rail transit, instead of \$2.5 billion as currently authorized.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, the matter of \$1,200,000,000 in bonds to be

guaranteed by the Federal Government must be decided.

We believe that for the first time in over a year they are sincere and are trying to carry out these two laws.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky. I would like to make reference to one other chapter in this bill which has to do with foreign aid. The other body increased the foreign aid chapter by \$112 million. This is the chapter so ably handled by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN), chairman of the subcommittee. His position prevailed. In conference the House version of the bill was adopted. We are below the budget \$457 million in this chapter. We were able to sustain the House figure.

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

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

Mr. WALDIE. I would like to ask a question of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations with relation to the subway. I am sorry I did not have a chance to ask the question sooner. I gathered that the subcommittee will be able to come back in the next 3 or 4 weeks with the appropriation that this bill denies for the completion or the continuation of the subway, depending upon the fulfillment of certain conditions, and I do not fully understand what those conditions are that must be fulfilled before that action could occur.

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

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

Mr. NATCHER. I would like to say to my friend from California that all we have ever said to the officials downtown is that the Highway Act of 1968 and the Highway Act of 1970 should be complied with. They are now in the process of completing the design report, which will be submitted back to the court, and also a report concerning the environmental portion of the case.

In addition to that, they are now in the process of entering into a contract to make the studies as required in the Highway Act of 1970. They are now, in my opinion, making a sincere effort to comply with the law, and they have taken the necessary steps which will bring about the appropriation of both of these amounts if they carry out the provisions of the 1968 and 1970 Highway Acts.

Mr. WALDIE. I understand that the steps they have taken up to date are still an insufficient compliance?

Mr. NATCHER. The steps they have taken in the last 5 days and subsequent to the deletion of the \$34,178,000 by the House, leads me, as one member of the committee, to believe that they are now sincere and they are trying to comply with the law, and that is all they have to do.

Mr. WALDIE. May I ask the distinguished gentleman one further question?

Mr. MAHON. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. WALDIE. At the present time does the gentleman believe they are attempting to comply but is not satisfied they

have complied sufficiently that we can make an appropriation in this bill?

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is correct.

In other words, if they continue as they have started in the last week they will put the Appropriations Committee in the position where only one thing can happen; and that is the recommendation that both amounts be approved.

Mr. WALDIE. I thank the gentleman.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I should like to raise a question as to section 305. By what authority, other than the language in this bill, is the Postmaster General permitted to transfer funds to pay salaries or for salary increases?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED) the chairman of the subcommittee, and a member of the conference committee.

Mr. STEED. This language was agreed to in the bill because by using transfer authority the Post Office Department will be able to live with the \$136 million cut we made in their budget request. It is because of this transfer authority that they are able to live with that cut. We believe this is the best way to do it.

Mr. GROSS. A cut from what to what?

Mr. STEED. The money in this bill is for payroll purposes, so we wanted to give them the elbow room that the transfer authority gives them, because by so doing they can live with the \$136 million cut we gave them.

Mr. GROSS. It is a fact that this is legislation in an appropriation bill, is it not?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct, that this language was brought back in technical disagreement. Although the conferees agreed, it is in technical disagreement.

Mr. GROSS. So it cannot be reached by a point of order?

Mr. MAHON. It can be reached by a vote by the House, when the motion is offered to recede and concur in this amendment of the Senate.

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

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

Mr. STEED. This authority applies only from now until July 1. They have a heavy payroll impact because of the two pay raises granted during this fiscal year, and this makes the authority necessary. I believe it is wise, because through this method they can absorb the reduction of \$136 million in the money they would otherwise have to have.

Mr. MAHON. I might say to the gen-

tleman from Iowa that this was considered by the other body and by the conferees as an economy move.

I read from page 110 of the Senate report:

In addition, the committee has included in the bill a new section 305—

To which the gentleman from Iowa made reference—

which authorizes the Post Office Department to utilize unobligated balances of any of its appropriations for increased pay costs.

That is the basis for this section.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, of course the money is being taken away from a fund for an authorized purpose.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And without any authorization on the part of the legislative committee. That is the point I wanted to make.

As with the SST proposition, I cannot understand how the committee could bring in a supplemental appropriation bill with this provision.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will advise the gentleman from Texas he has consumed 25 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. And has 5 minutes remaining.

The SPEAKER. Under the Reorganization Act, the minority is entitled to equal time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly concerned about the funding of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act which authorizes \$10 million for fiscal year 1971 and \$20 million for fiscal year 1972. The other body included in the second supplemental \$5 million for the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act. I am deeply disappointed, because I understand the conference report has not included that money. It was provided by the Senate. On April 21, I testified before the Senate subcommittee which recognized the urgent need to implement this program.

Let me read briefly a statement, not of mine, but of the personnel in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare responsible for implementing this act.

I quote from the HEW memo entitled "Implementation Plan To Carry Out the HEW responsibilities under the Lead-Paint Poisoning Prevention Act of 1971" as follows:

Inaction on this problem would be an economic and human disaster. An estimated 16,000 little children are being treated for severe lead poisoning each year at a cost of \$1,800—a total of \$28,000,000 annually . . . Cases of severe and mental retardation (800 children each year) require lifetime institutionalization at a cost of \$4,000 per year each, or \$3,200,000 annually. The economic cost to the Nation for one year's damage for this group of children is \$32,560,000."

Mr. Speaker, it has been estimated that some 225,000 children between the ages of 1 and 6 across this country suffer from lead-based paint poisoning. The price of not including money to fund this program of detection and treatment, the price of institutional care, is much greater than that which would have been provided under the Senate second sup-

plemental appropriations bill to treat these cases of lead-based paint poisoning. How can little children be allowed to suffer when this disease is preventable.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the shortness of time here, I would say that the Senate added \$5 million for grants to units of local government for programs of treating and screening lead-based paint as authorized by certain legislation. It was considered by the conferees that it could better be handled in the regular bill which will be forthcoming in a few weeks. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) for any comment that he desires to make. It was not a denial of the threat, but a feeling that it should be postponed until the regular bill was before us.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. Of course, you are not supposed to say what takes place in the conference, but I can say to my friend from New York there was one guy there with a waxed mustache who was in favor of this thing.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Not just now.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. To correct a misstatement of the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. To the gentleman from Brooklyn?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It was the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) who suggested that the House recede on this item, whereupon the Senate receded.

Mr. FLOOD. Can you imagine me being wrong? He is absolutely right. What happened is this: In about—I am for this thing 1,000 percent—but in about 6 weeks the committee will be here with the 1972 Labor-HEW appropriation bill, and I assure my friend from Brooklyn (Mr. ROONEY) and my friend the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) that there will be ample funds, I believe, and I am sure of it, in the 1972 appropriation bill for this very, very bad problem. For instance, my friend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PATTEN) who is on my subcommittee knows this problem well, and I can say you have nothing to worry about.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Would it not be better to handle the \$58 million for the airlines in the regular course of business as we are going to do for the lead-based paint situation? Honestly, Mr. Speaker, I do not understand how we can add \$58 million as a direct subsidy to the airlines in this kind of a legislative process. Should there not be a hearing and questions and answers?

Mr. MAHON. There was a hearing by the subcommittee which included questions and answers in connection with this amount. This matter will be before us in connection with the consideration of the items in disagreement.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Texas yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Does the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) understand that this increase in money was inserted by the other body, that it was in conference and that they insisted upon it, and that this amount now brought back in this conference report was not suggested by the House conferees at all. We all have to bear in mind that this is a \$7 billion bill that cuts all the way across Government and that we are going to have payless pay days if we do not pass this bill tonight.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. And we give away \$58 million in the process?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. No; we do not give away anything.

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

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the \$58 million to the airlines is no way a give away; it is not a subsidy. This is \$58 million which the airlines have paid into the Treasury of the United States and they are entitled to its return. We have a moral responsibility. We have twisted arms and gotten these people to put in their \$58 million to help build the SST.

Now, certain Members of this House have seen fit to terminate the SST, and it seems to be only right and proper, since these companies paid the money into the Treasury and since they have not had the use of it over the years, that it should be returned.

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

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Did the White House ask for this money to be included?

Mr. BOW. The White House did not ask for this money to be included. I hope that answers the question of the gentleman.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield very briefly to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The House Appropriations Committee came in with a supplemental appropriation bill for this item of \$85 million and tonight here we find it almost doubled.

What kind of a price tag did you put on the washout of the SST in your committee?

Mr. BOW. I will say this: If we had left the \$85 million in and had gone forward with the SST, we would have had a plane flying and we would have stayed in the aircraft business and would have been able to bring about a better balance-of-payments situation. But this has been brought about by those who destroyed the SST but who are now beginning to see the price they are going to have to pay for its cancellation.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman's answer is pretty "iffy." If the dog had not stopped, he would have caught the rabbit. What I am trying to find out is how the House Appropriations Committee arrived at the original figure of \$85 million and almost doubled the cost of the washout of the SST in conference?

Mr. BOW. It is very plain that there is a contract with Boeing and General Electric as well as the fact that the airlines have put their money into it. I think this is a pretty honest figure on the washout.

Mr. GROSS. But going from \$85 to \$155 million is a big jump almost overnight. The taxpayers also saw their money put into this project.

Mr. BOW. I agree with the gentleman and those who voted to defeat the program will have to live with these termination costs.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, as one of the conferees on H.R. 8190 making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, I signed the conference report except as to item 57, civil supersonic aircraft termination. I concur with the action of the Senate and agreed to by the House conferees in terminating further research and development of the SST. However, I am concerned with the amount carried in this bill to effect that termination. That amount is \$155,800,000.

The Department of Transportation originally requested a total of \$97.3 million. This was to be used to refund the manufacturers' share of development costs, to cover the costs of terminating the contracts with the manufacturers and to provide for Federal expenses incurred in terminating the development program.

The Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Transportation requested a ruling from the Comptroller General of the United States relative to the Government's liability to the contractors as a result of the termination of the program for the convenience of the Government. The Comptroller General advised the committee the contracts with Boeing and General Electric provided for reimbursement of the contractor's share of allowable costs upon such termination for convenience. The Comptroller General further stated that under the provisions of the contracts, the Government's maximum liability to Boeing for refund of its allowable cost share is \$52.145 million and the Government's maximum liability for refund to General Electric's allowable cost share is \$33.185 million. The cost share liability thus amounted to \$85.33 million. The Department of Transportation further requested \$11,970,000 in termination costs to closeout the SST program. These costs included such items as inventory transportation, storage and disposition costs, claims from subcontractors, reimbursement for audit assistance from the Defense Contract Audit Agency and the Defense Contract Administrative Services Region and the Department of Transportation's in-house expenses associated with the termination.

The committee disallowed this request for \$11.9 million. I agreed with this action and so voted in the committee. The Department did not justify this amount to the satisfaction of the members of the committee. The justification was too general and lacked specificity. There is little question that the broad categories outlined by the Department will cost considerable sums of money. But the committee and the Congress is

entitled to know in greater detail and in what areas just what those costs will be. The bill before us carries \$11.9 million that the Department requested for these closeout costs. I am opposed to appropriating this amount at this time.

The termination costs also include \$58.5 million to be refunded to certain airlines. This is described as risk capital toward the development program of the SST. The Department of Transportation did not request any appropriation to repay these funds and our subcommittee did not recommend this payment when it reported the bill. There is no legal obligation, no contract, between the Government and the airlines relative to this matter. It might very well be that there is a moral obligation to repay the airlines. There is some indication that the Government persuaded the airlines to contribute risk capital to the SST program. There is further indication that the airlines made this contribution on the grounds and assumption that the research, development, construction of two prototypes and 100 hours of test flying would all be accomplished. It appears that the airlines contributed in good faith and were convinced that the Government would pursue its part to the end of the research and development program. In equity and good conscience, it might very well be that the Government should repay the airlines risk capital. However, this matter should be explored further by the subcommittee dealing with this matter. Hearings should be held. Hence, I do not, at this time, approve the \$58.5 million that is included in this bill to repay the risk capital to the concerned airlines.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote "aye" on the conference report on this bill, because it confirms the action of the Senate in killing the SST program.

I shall vote "no" on the amendment agreed to by the conferees, because it contains \$12 million for termination administrative costs and \$58 million for payment to various airline companies. No case was made for either amount before my appropriations subcommittee or in any hearing. I am a member of the Department of Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee which reviewed the matter. I approve of the allowance of \$85 million to be made available to the contractors. They are entitled to termination costs and the correctness of the amount will be determined by detailed audit by the General Accounting Office.

However, the request for the \$12 million was supported only by speculative testimony. The amount was obviously uncertain and our subcommittee voted unanimously to delete the item.

The only statement made before our subcommittee on the airlines' request was filed by the Air Transport Association. No testimony was given in support of it. There was no request for it by the executive branch. It may be that the airlines are entitled to this money, but a case ought to be made for it to justify approval of such a substantial amount.

I believe the matter should be investigated by the executive branch and its recommendation reported to the Con-

gress for its action. There ought to be hearings by an appropriate congressional committee so that the House is fully informed.

Yes, termination costs for ending the SST program should be paid, but they must be supportable costs properly chargeable to the undertaking.

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, I have supported the two SST prototypes to answer the environmental and technical questions about the SST. Also, the loss of between 1,200 and 1,500 jobs in the First Congressional District of Connecticut, which is experiencing devastating 6.5 percent unemployment, weighed heavily in my decision. For these and other reasons, I supported the construction of two prototypes and, last week, I voted to continue the program.

After the House vote last week, spokesmen of the leading manufacturers, Boeing and General Electric, announced that the costs to reestablish the SST would be an additional \$500 million to \$1 billion, and that the U.S. Government would have to assume all the costs of development. After the painful deliberations that culminated in my decision to vote for the SST, I again evaluated the arguments. The additional costs to start up the SST and the condition that the U.S. Government should assume all the development costs have caused me to change my mind on the SST.

I cannot justify these additional costs and obligations on the U.S. Government. We have more pressing priorities in our country.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if given the opportunity, I will vote against continuation of the SST because of these new additional costs.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the gentleman from Kentucky and the conferee's position on the transportation situation in the District of Columbia.

The position as expressed by our colleague is one of principle and upholds the actions taken by the Congress in the past.

As I stated on the floor earlier this week, I have become personally involved in an attempt to resolve this impasse as rapidly as possible. I stated then and repeat today that I am hopefully confident that this will be achieved, and confident that it can be achieved, given the cooperation and earnest efforts of those officials in the responsible positions where the necessary decisions must be made.

The Committee on Public Works is of the opinion that the Highway Acts of 1968 and 1970 were clear in their intent and that the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky has correctly interpreted the intent of these acts.

The position of the conferees of both Houses that there is no question that there is a need for a balanced system of transportation in the Nation's Capital is certainly in agreement with that of the Committee on Public Works.

I would like to congratulate the Secretary of Transportation for the initiative he has displayed in bringing the different parties together, which made possible what I consider an initial, but most significant, forward thrust which, I do be-

lieve, will finally "get the show on the road," I and others will work closely with him and the District of Columbia government in this direction.

I would like to compliment those members of the Committee on Public Works on their continued support and participation in this operation.

The most respected gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. NATCHER, and the Appropriations Committee are to be commended for their continuing efforts to insure that the will of the Congress and the laws of the land are carried out, and yet that this deadlock, which gives as neither Metro nor highways be broken.

It is heartening indeed to see that we may finally be on our way to resolving this long-standing problem.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. 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. The Chair will count.

One hundred eighty-two Members are present, not a quorum.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 264, nays 28, not voting 140, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

YEAS—264

Abernethy	Clark	Gallagher
Abzug	Clausen	Glaismo
Adams	Don H.	Gibbons
Alexander	Clawson, Del	Goldwater
Anderson,	Clay	Gonzalez
Calif.	Cleveland	Grasso
Anderson, III.	Colmer	Gray
Anderson,	Cotter	Green, Pa.
Tenn.	Coughlin	Griffin
Andrews, Ala.	Culver	Grover
Andrews,	Daniel, Va.	Gubser
N. Dak.	Daniels, N.J.	Hagan
Annunzio	Danielson	Hamilton
Arends	Davis, Ga.	Hanley
Ashley	Davis, S.C.	Hanna
Aspin	Davis, Wis.	Hansen, Idaho
Aspinall	de la Garza	Hansen, Wash.
Baker	Delaney	Hathaway
Begich	Dellenback	Hechler, W. Va.
Belcher	Dellums	Heckler, Mass.
Bergland	Denholm	Helstoski
Bevill	Dennis	Henderson
Blaggi	Derwinski	Hicks, Wash.
Biester	Dickinson	Hillis
Bingham	Diggs	Hogan
Blackburn	Donohue	Horton
Blatnik	Downing	Howard
Boggs	Duncan	Hunt
Boland	du Pont	Hutchinson
Bolling	Eckhardt	Jacobs
Bow	Edwards, Ala.	Jarman
Brademas	Edwards, Calif.	Johnson, Calif.
Brinkley	Eilberg	Johnson, Pa.
Brooks	Eshleman	Jonas
Broomfield	Evans, Colo.	Jones, Ala.
Brown, Mich.	Fascell	Jones, N.C.
Brown, Ohio	Fish	Jones, Tenn.
Broyhill, Va.	Flood	Kazen
Buchanan	Ford, Gerald R.	Keith
Burke, Mass.	Ford,	King
Burlinson, Tex.	William D.	Koch
Burton	Forsythe	Kuykendall
Byrnes, Wis.	Fountain	Kyl
Byron	Fraser	Kyros
Caffery	Frelinghuysen	Lennon
Camp	Frenzel	Link
Carter	Fulton, Pa.	Long, Md.
Casey, Tex.	Fuqua	Lujan
Chamberlain	Galifianakis	McClory

McCloskey	Pettis
McCollister	Pickle
McCormack	Pike
McDade	Pirnie
McDonald,	Poage
Mich.	Podell
McEwen	Poff
McFall	Powell
McKay	Price, Tex.
McKinney	Pucinski
Macdonald,	Purcell
Mass.	Quie
Madden	Quillen
Mahon	Randall
Mailliard	Rees
Martin	Reid, Ill.
Matsunaga	Rhodes
Mayne	Roberts
Mazzoll	Robinson, Va.
Meeds	Robison, N.Y.
Mikva	Rodino
Miller, Ohio	Roe
Minish	Rogers
Mitchell	Rooney, N.Y.
Mizell	Roush
Mollohan	Roybal
Monagan	Ruppe
Montgomery	Ruth
Moorhead	Ryan
Morgan	Sandman
Morse	Satterfield
Mosher	Scheuer
Moss	Scott
Murphy, III.	Seiberling
Natcher	Shoup
Nelsen	Shriver
Obey	Sisk
O'Hara	Skubitz
O'Neill	Slack
Passman	Smith, Calif.
Patten	Smith, Iowa
Pelly	Smith, N.Y.
Perkins	Stafford

NAYS—28

Archer	Hicks, Mass.	Saylor
Bennett	Kastenmeier	Schmitz
Chisholm	McClure	Schwengel
Collier	Nichols	Spence
Crane	O'Konski	Teague, Tex.
Drinan	Rarick	Thompson, Ga.
Dulski	Reuss	Thone
Goodling	Riegle	Young, Fla.
Gross	Roncallo	
Haley	Rosenthal	

NOT VOTING—140

Abbitt	Frey	Mink
Abourezk	Fulton, Tenn.	Minshall
Addabbo	Garmatz	Murphy, N.Y.
Ashbrook	Gaydos	Myers
Badillo	Gettys	Nedzi
Baring	Green, Ore.	Nix
Barrett	Griffiths	Patman
Bell	Gude	Pepper
Betts	Hall	Peyster
Blanton	Halpern	Preyer, N.C.
Brasco	Hammer-	Price, Ill.
Bray	schmidt	Pryor, Ark.
Brotzman	Harrington	Rallsback
Broyhill, N.C.	Harsha	Rangel
Burke, Fla.	Harvey	Reid, N.Y.
Burlison, Mo.	Hastings	Rooney, Pa.
Byrne, Pa.	Hawkins	Rostenkowski
Cabell	Hays	Rousselot
Carey, N.Y.	Hébert	Roy
Carney	Hollifield	Runnels
Cederberg	Hosmer	St Germain
Celler	Hull	Sarbanes
Chappell	Hungate	Scherle
Clancy	Ichord	Schneebell
Collins, III.	Karth	Sebelius
Collins, Tex.	Keating	Shibley
Conable	Kee	Sikes
Conte	Kemp	Snyder
Conyers	Kluczynski	Springer
Corman	Landgrebe	Staggers
Dent	Landrum	Stratton
Devine	Latta	Sullivan
Dingell	Leggett	Teague, Calif.
Dorn	Lent	Terry
Dow	Lloyd	Udall
Dowdy	Long, La.	Wampler
Dwyer	McCulloch	Ware
Edmondson	McKevitt	Whalen
Edwards, La.	McMillan	Wiggins
Erlenborn	Mann	Williams
Esch	Mathias, Calif.	Winn
Evins, Tenn.	Mathis, Ga.	Wyatt
Findley	Melcher	Wyder
Fisher	Metcalfe	Wylie
Flowers	Michel	Yatron
Flynt	Miller, Calif.	Young, Tex.
Foley	Mills	Zwach

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Devine.	Mr. Stagers with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Williams.	Mr. Hays with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Reid of New York.	Mr. Brasco with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Kemp.	Mrs. Griffiths with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Schneebell.	Mr. Pepper with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Hastings.	Mr. Sikes with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Mathias of California.	Mr. Blanton with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Conable.	Mr. Chappell with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Terry.	Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Lloyd.	Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Bray.	Mr. Young of Texas with Mr. Collins of Texas.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Sarbanes.	Mr. Mann with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Snyder.	Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Ware.	Mr. McMillan with Mr. Winn.
Mrs. Mink with Mr. Rangel.	Mr. Abbott with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Collins of Illinois.	Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Dow with Mr. Nix.	Mr. Conyers with Mr. Yatron.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Wyder.	Mr. Ichord with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Wylie.	Mr. Shibley with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Minshall.	Mr. Foley with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Gude.	Mr. Karth with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Springer.	Mr. Joseph V. Stanton with Mr. Whalen.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Sebelius.	Mr. Carney with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Scherle.	Mr. Kee with Mr. Myers.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Bell.	Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Price of Illinois with Mr. Finley.	Mr. Preyer of North Carolina with Mr. Rousselot.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Hammerschmidt.	Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Rallsback.
Mr. Melcher with Mr. Harvey.	Mr. Roy with Mr. Peyster.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Michel.	Mr. Baring with Mr. McKevitt.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Latta.	Mr. Gettys with Mr. Lent.
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Keating.	Mr. Leggett with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Burlison of Missouri with Mr. Landgrebe.	Mr. Corman with Mr. Abourezk.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Cabell.	Mr. Flowers with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Gaydos with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.	Mr. Fisher with Mr. Mathis of Georgia.
Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Runnels.	Mr. Ashley changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 2:  
Page 2, line 9, insert:

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE  
PAYMENTS AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount of \$1,025,000 for contracts and grants for scientific research under the Act of August 4, 1965 (7 U.S.C. 450(i)), to remain available until expended.

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$1,000,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 4:  
On page 3, line 13, insert:

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION  
EMERGENCY CREDIT REVOLVING FUND

For an additional amount for the "Emergency credit revolving fund", as authorized by the Act of August 8, 1961 (7 U.S.C. 1967), \$65,000,000, to remain available until expended.

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 18:  
On page 6, line 6, insert:

## CAPITAL OUTLAY

For an additional amount for "Capital outlay," to remain available until expended, \$37,166,393, of which \$1,285,000 shall be payable from the highway fund and \$350,000 from the sanitary sewage works fund: *Provided*, That \$124,000 shall be available for construction services by the Director of General Services or by contract for architectural engineering services, as may be determined by the Commissioner.

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum first named in said amendment, insert "\$2,988,393".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 26:  
On page 7, line 22, insert:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE  
ADMINISTRATION

## RESEARCH AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

The \$10,000,000 provided under this head in the Independent Offices and Housing and

Urban Development Appropriation Act, 1971, for basic institutional and technical services for Federal agencies resident at the Mississippi Test Facility/Slidell Computer Complex and other NASA facilities in pursuit of space and environmental missions shall be available for equipment and alteration and modification of existing buildings, to whatever extent may be required to furnish such services, and for the construction of a flow basin and flood plain simulation facility; and shall remain available until September 30, 1971.

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 29. Page 9, line 10, insert:

## GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH  
For an additional amount for "Surveys, investigations, and research", \$750,000, to remain available until expended.

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 37. Page 13, line 15, insert:

COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH PLANNING AND  
SERVICES

For an additional amount for "comprehensive health planning and services", to carry out section 329 of the Public Health Service Act, \$3,000,000, to remain available through June 30, 1972.

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 38, page 13, line 20, insert:

## MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH

For an additional amount for "Maternal and child health", \$10,000,000, for carrying out title X of the Public Health Service Act, Public Law 91-572, for expanding and improving family planning services, to remain available until December 31, 1971.

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in the amendment, insert "\$6,000,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 39. Page 14, line 1, insert:

## REGIONAL MEDICAL PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Regional medical programs" to carry out title IX of the Public Health Service Act, \$10,000,000, which shall remain available until June 30, 1972.

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 41. Page 15, line 1, insert: "which shall be expended without regard to the limitations of sections 1108(a) (1) and 1108(b)(1) of the Social Security Act."

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 46. Page 16, line 9, insert:

For payment in eleven equal shares, one each, to the surviving heirs of Marguerite Russell Bowden, deceased sister; the surviving heirs of Robert Lee Russell, deceased brother; Mary Willie Russell Green, Ina Russell Stacy, Patience Russell Peterson, Carolyn Russell, William John Russell, Fielding Dillard Russell, Henry Edward Russell, Alexander Brevard Russell, brothers of Richard Brevard Russell, late a Senator from the State of Georgia, \$49,500.

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 49. Page 18, line 20, strike out:

## CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

## JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

For an amount (to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman and the chairman of the subcommittee) necessary to enable the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy, under authority of the Employment Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 23, sec. 5), to undertake a study to develop reliable, comprehensive, and factual information concerning welfare programs and needs in the United States, \$500,000.

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

For an amount (to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman and the chairman of the subcommittee) necessary to enable the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy, under authority of the Employment Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 23, sec. 5), to undertake a study to develop reliable, comprehensive, and factual information concerning welfare programs and needs in the United States, \$500,000, to remain available until June 30, 1973.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 57. Page 25, line 9, insert:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

CIVIL SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT

For expenses necessary for the termination of the civil supersonic aircraft program, \$155,800,000.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

CIVIL SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT

TERMINATION

For expenses necessary for the termination of the civil supersonic aircraft program, and for refund of amounts contributed by airlines toward the civil supersonic aircraft research and development program, \$155,800,000, to remain available until expended.

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

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 118, nays 156, answered "present" 1, not voting 157, as follows:

[Roll No. 105]

YEAS—118

- |                  |               |                 |
|------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Abernethy        | Davis, S.C.   | Johnson, Calif. |
| Adams            | Davis, Wis.   | Johnson, Pa.    |
| Alexander        | de la Garza   | Jonas           |
| Anderson, Ill.   | Dellenback    | Jones, Ala.     |
| Andrews, Ala.    | Dennis        | Keith           |
| Andrews, N. Dak. | Downing       | King            |
| Annunzio         | Duncan        | Kuykendall      |
| Aspinall         | du Pont       | Kyl             |
| Begich           | Eckhardt      | Lujan           |
| Bergland         | Edwards, Ala. | McCloskey       |
| Bolling          | Eilberg       | McClure         |
| Bow              | Evans, Colo.  | McCormack       |
| Brooks           | Fascell       | McDade          |
| Broyhill, Va.    | Fish          | McFall          |
| Burleson, Tex.   | Flood         | McKinney        |
| Byrnes, Wis.     | Frelinghuysen | Mahon           |
| Caffery          | Fuqua         | Mailliard       |
| Carter           | Gialmo        | Meeds           |
| Casey, Tex.      | Gibbons       | Mollohan        |
| Chamberlain      | Grasso        | Monagan         |
| Clark            | Griffin       | Montgomery      |
| Clausen, Don H.  | Hagan         | Moorhead        |
| Colmer           | Hansen, Idaho | Morgan          |
| Crane            | Hansen, Wash. | Morse           |
| Davis, Ga.       | Hathaway      | Natcher         |
|                  | Hicks, Wash.  | O'Neill         |
|                  | Horton        | Passman         |

- |              |                |               |
|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| Patten       | Selberling     | Stubblefield  |
| Pelly        | Shoup          | Stuckey       |
| Pettis       | Slack          | Talcott       |
| Pickle       | Smith, Iowa    | Teague, Tex.  |
| Poage        | Smith, N.Y.    | Thomson, Wis. |
| Purcell      | Stafford       | Ullman        |
| Reid, Ill.   | Stanton        | Waggoner      |
| Rhodes       | J. William     | Watts         |
| Roberts      | Stanton,       | White         |
| Rogers       | James V.       | Whitehurst    |
| Roncallo     | Steele         | Widnall       |
| Rooney, N.Y. | Steiger, Ariz. | Wilson,       |
| Ruppe        | Steiger, Wis.  | Charles H.    |
| Satterfield  | Stratton       | Wright        |

NAYS—156

- |                  |                 |               |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Abzug            | Goldwater       | Podell        |
| Anderson, Calif. | Gonzalez        | Poff          |
| Archer           | Goodling        | Powell        |
| Arends           | Gray            | Price, Tex.   |
| Ashley           | Green, Pa.      | Pucinski      |
| Aspin            | Gross           | Qule          |
| Belcher          | Grover          | Quillen       |
| Bennett          | Gubser          | Randall       |
| Bevill           | Haley           | Rees          |
| Blaggi           | Hamilton        | Reuss         |
| Blester          | Hanley          | Riegler       |
| Bingham          | Hechler, W. Va. | Robinson, Va. |
| Blackburn        | Heckler, Mass.  | Robison, N.Y. |
| Blatnik          | Helstoski       | Rodino        |
| Boland           | Henderson       | Roe           |
| Brademas         | Hicks, Mass.    | Rosenthal     |
| Brinkley         | Hillis          | Roush         |
| Broomfield       | Howard          | Roybal        |
| Brown, Mich.     | Hunt            | Ruth          |
| Brown, Ohio      | Jacobs          | Ryan          |
| Broyhill, N.C.   | Jarman          | Sandman       |
| Buchanan         | Jones, N.C.     | Saylor        |
| Burke, Mass.     | Jones, Tenn.    | Scheuer       |
| Burton           | Kastenmeier     | Schmitz       |
| Byron            | Kazen           | Schwengel     |
| Camp             | Koch            | Scott         |
| Clawson, Del.    | Kyros           | Shriver       |
| Cleveland        | Lennon          | Skubitz       |
| Collier          | Link            | Spence        |
| Cotter           | Long, Md.       | Steed         |
| Coughlin         | McClory         | Stephens      |
| Daniel, Va.      | McCollister     | Stokes        |
| Daniels, N.J.    | McDonald,       | Symington     |
| Danielson        | Mich.           | Taylor        |
| Delaney          | McKay           | Terry         |
| Dellums          | Macdonald,      | Thompson, Ga. |
| Denholm          | Mass.           | Thone         |
| Derwinski        | Madden          | Tiernan       |
| Dingell          | Martin          | Van Deerlin   |
| Donohue          | Matsunaga       | Vander Jagt   |
| Drinan           | Mayne           | Vanik         |
| Dulski           | Mazzoli         | Veysey        |
| Edwards, Calif.  | Mikva           | Vigorito      |
| Eshleman         | Miller, Ohio    | Waldie        |
| Ford, Gerald R.  | Minish          | Whalley       |
| Ford,            | Mitchell        | Wilson, Bob   |
| William D.       | Mizell          | Wolf          |
| Fountain         | Murphy, Ill.    | Wyman         |
| Fraser           | Nedzi           | Yates         |
| Frenzel          | Nelsen          | Young, Fla.   |
| Fulton, Pa.      | Obey            | Zablocki      |
| Gallifanakis     | O'Hara          | Zion          |
| Gallagher        | O'Konski        |               |
|                  | Perkins         |               |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

- Hanna
- NOT VOTING—157

- |               |               |            |
|---------------|---------------|------------|
| Abbutt        | Conable       | Gude       |
| Abourezk      | Conte         | Hall       |
| Addabbo       | Conyers       | Halpern    |
| Anderson,     | Corman        | Hammer-    |
| Tenn.         | Culver        | schmidt    |
| Ashbrook      | Dent          | Harrington |
| Badillo       | Devine        | Harsha     |
| Baker         | Dickinson     | Harvey     |
| Baring        | Diggs         | Hastings   |
| Barrett       | Dorn          | Hawkins    |
| Bell          | Dow           | Hays       |
| Betts         | Dowdy         | Hébert     |
| Blanton       | Dwyer         | Hogan      |
| Boggs         | Edmondson     | Hollifield |
| Brasco        | Edwards, La.  | Hosmer     |
| Bray          | Erlenborn     | Hull       |
| Brotzman      | Esch          | Hungate    |
| Burke, Fla.   | Evins, Tenn.  | Hutchinson |
| Burlison, Mo. | Findley       | Ichord     |
| Byrne, Pa.    | Fisher        | Karth      |
| Cabell        | Flowers       | Keating    |
| Carey, N.Y.   | Flynt         | Kee        |
| Carney        | Foley         | Kemp       |
| Cederberg     | Forsythe      | Kluczynski |
| Celler        | Frey          | Landgrebe  |
| Chappell      | Fulton, Tenn. | Landrum    |
| Chisholm      | Garmatz       | Latta      |
| Clancy        | Gaydos        | Leggett    |
| Clay          | Gettys        | Lent       |
| Collins, Ill. | Green, Oreg.  | Lloyd      |
| Collins, Tex. | Griffiths     | Long, La.  |

- |                 |              |                |
|-----------------|--------------|----------------|
| McCulloch       | Peysner      | Sisk           |
| McEwen          | Pike         | Smith, Calif.  |
| McKevitt        | Pirnie       | Snyder         |
| McMillan        | Preyer, N.C. | Springer       |
| Mann            | Price, Ill.  | Stagers        |
| Mathias, Calif. | Pryor, Ark.  | Sullivan       |
| Mathis, Ga.     | Rallsback    | Teague, Calif. |
| Melcher         | Rangel       | Thompson, N.J. |
| Metcalfe        | Rarick       | Udall          |
| Michel          | Reid, N.Y.   | Wampler        |
| Miller, Calif.  | Rooney, Pa.  | Ware           |
| Mills           | Rostenkowski | Whalen         |
| Mink            | Rousselot    | Whitten        |
| Minshall        | Roy          | Wiggins        |
| Mosher          | Runnels      | Williams       |
| Moss            | St Germain   | Winn           |
| Murphy, N.Y.    | Sarbanes     | Wyatt          |
| Myers           | Scherle      | Wydler         |
| Nichols         | Schneebeil   | Wylie          |
| Nix             | Sebelius     | Yatron         |
| Patman          | Shipley      | Young, Tex.    |
| Pepper          | Sikes        | Zwach          |

So the motion was rejected.  
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

- On this vote:  
Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Moss against.  
Mr. Reid of New York for, with Mr. Rousselot against.  
Mr. Conte for, with Mr. Hosmer against.  
Mr. Forsythe for, with Mr. Snyder against.  
Mrs. Dwyer for, with Mr. Hébert against.  
Mr. Kee for, with Mr. Landgrebe against.

- Until further notice:  
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Devine.  
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Hogan.  
Mr. Dent with Mr. Williams.  
Mr. Celler with Mr. Pirnie.  
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Hastings.  
Mr. Hays with Mr. Ashbrook.  
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Halpern.  
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Harrington.  
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Mink.  
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Dow.  
Mr. Sarbanes with Mr. Nix.  
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Hawkins.  
Mr. Melcher with Mr. McKevitt.  
Mr. Mann with Mr. Wylie.  
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Frey.  
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Erlenborn.  
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Teague of California.  
Mr. Hull with Mr. Hall.  
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Ware.  
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Kemp.  
Mr. Mills with Mr. Cederberg.  
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Metcalfe.  
Mr. Rangel with Mr. Corman.  
Mr. Clay with Mr. Leggett.  
Mr. Yatron with Mr. Collins of Illinois.  
Mr. Abbutt with Mr. Collins of Texas.  
Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania with Mr. Schneebeil.  
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Dickinson.  
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Betts.  
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Baker.  
Mr. Runnels with Mr. Winn.  
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Harvey.  
Mr. Pike with Mrs. Peysner.  
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Hammerschmidt.  
Mr. Karth with Mr. Whalen.  
Mr. Young of Texas with Mr. Bell.  
Mr. Udall with Mr. Brotzman.  
Mr. Stagers with Mr. Burke of Florida.  
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Michel.  
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Mathias of California.  
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Rallsback.  
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Wampler.  
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Findley.  
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Lloyd.  
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Lent.  
Mr. Patman with Mr. Conable.  
Mr. Price of Illinois with Mr. Smith of California.  
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Bray.  
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. McEwen.  
Mr. Carey with Mr. Mosher.  
Mr. Carney with Mr. Wiggins.  
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Wyatt.  
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Clancy.  
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Esch.

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Harsha.  
 Mr. Blanton with Mr. Sebelius.  
 Mr. Burlison of Missouri with Mr. Scherle.  
 Mr. Roy with Mr. Keating.  
 Mr. Foley with Mr. Gude.  
 Mr. Ewins of Tennessee with Mr. Springer.  
 Mr. Mathis of Georgia with Mr. Wylder.  
 Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Myers.  
 Mr. Culver with Mr. Minshall.  
 Mr. Dorn with Mr. Latta.  
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Hutchinson.  
 Mr. Abourezk with Mr. Chappell.  
 Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Flowers.  
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Gettys.  
 Mr. Gaydos with Mr. Long of Louisiana.  
 Mr. Nichols with Mr. Preyer of North Carolina.  
 Mr. Rarick with Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. EVANS of Colorado changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss). Had he been present, he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
 CIVIL SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT  
 TERMINATION

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the termination of development of the civil supersonic aircraft and to refund the contractors' cost shares, \$97,300,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. What is the parliamentary situation with respect to this motion?

The SPEAKER. Perhaps the gentleman from Texas will explain it.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas. I understand that we are now going from \$155,800,000 down to \$97.3 million. Is that the gentleman's motion?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me, the House already tonight has stricken the development of the supersonic transport. That was done in a previous action on amendment No. 56. Having stricken funds for the development program for the SST, we come to the question of termination costs.

In a previous vote, on amendment No. 57, we voted on whether or not to approve the \$155,800,000 figure in termination costs. Those costs would go to the manufacturers, the producers of the SST

as cancellation costs, as may be agreed. It also included \$58.5 million for the airlines. The airlines, at the urging and insistence of the Department of Transportation, put up cash of about \$58 million. Some airlines put up \$1 million, some airlines \$750,000, and so on, in order to support the development program and help keep it going.

The program has now been canceled through no fault of the airlines, through no fault of the companies that were constructing the SST, and it was felt they were entitled to get their money back, having put it up in good faith. But, at this point, the House, in voting down the original motion on amendment No. 57, has decided against paying the termination costs—any of the termination costs. I am sure the House wants to pay termination costs, at some level. It certainly would seem unrealistic to believe that the House would not want to pay any termination costs.

The President sent up a budget estimate of termination costs in the total sum of \$97,300,000. The motion which is now before us, as to amendment 57, would provide termination costs in the sum of \$97.3 million, and I would hope that we could agree on this amount without difficulty.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, what intrigues me is that the original House bill provided, a week or so ago, for \$85 million, and then there was reported back here this evening the amount of \$155,800,000. I do not know the basis for the \$97 million, but I will say to the gentleman that I have never heard of an automatic transmission being devised that would shift gears faster than this. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MAHON. I would like to say that the other body put in \$155,800,000 for termination costs. There were 84 different amendments made to this bill in the Senate, and there was a great deal of interest on the part of certain people in the Senate to kill the SST, and there was a great deal of interest on the part of certain people to keep it alive.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I understand that.  
 Mr. MAHON. In the conference settlement with the Senate it was agreed to go along with the figure of \$155,800,000. In the original committee bill, in the House, which was later overturned in the House, the sum of \$85,330,000 was provided.

Mr. GROSS. That is correct.  
 Mr. MAHON. But at that time there was pending before us a request for \$12 million for various related expenses, and on that we said in effect, "Let's wait until we can explore the matter further." We put in the \$85.3 million and rejected \$12 million of the budget estimate. But now in order to try to come to some agreement which may be reasonably satisfactory, we propose the \$85 million plus the \$12 million in the budget, hoping this will be satisfactory to the House and that we can agree to this and conclude the matter.

Mr. GROSS. With this fast revision in figures, apparently \$12 million is not now needed to establish who gets the money.

Mr. MAHON. That is part of the

purpose of the \$12 million, to establish the costs. There are many other factors, but it is true that these costs have to be negotiated. We cannot negotiate the costs.

These are the termination costs that have been estimated to us—\$85 million, plus the \$12 million.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Department of Transportation, the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL), a member of the conference committee.

Mr. McFALL. The \$12 million is the cost to the Government to close out the program. There are subcontractors all over the country who have their part of the program in the various stages of development. They all have to be inventoried. They all have to be assessed. They all have to be counted. The funds will also be available to reimburse the Defense Contract Audit Agency.

Mr. GROSS. My question is, how much of the auditing money is necessary to get back to the taxpayers their money?

Mr. McFALL. I did not want to kill the SST in the first place, but since Congress has canceled the program, I feel we should pay the termination costs.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Let me say to the chairman, I support the chairman's proposal. The \$85 million which is made available for the primary contractors will be audited by the General Accounting Office. The \$12 million which is being made available also is for the purposes stated by the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL) and that will be supervised by the General Accounting Office.

So I believe this is a proper proposal.

Let me say to the gentleman, those of us who were opposed to the SST are willing to pay proper termination costs. There was no showing made by the airlines before the Department of Transportation Subcommittee, of which I am a Member. There was no recommendation made by the executive branch. It is for the reason that there ought to be a showing made by the airlines the House voted as it did.

Mr. MAHON. I would say to the gentleman that the subcommittee did have hearings on the question of the amounts contributed by the airlines—the \$58.5 million—but the House did not add this money. It was added in the other body, and it was a part of the conference agreement with the other body.

Mr. YATES. There was no recommendation by the executive branch as to the propriety of the cost figures, and I suggest to the gentleman this should be done before it is voted on.

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

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

Mr. ADAMS. It is very difficult, at a time like this, not to feel quite bitter toward those who have canceled this program and who then refuse to pay the termination costs.

I want to state that the situation the House faced earlier tonight was that

there had been—and there was no question about it—a situation where the airlines put in the amount the chairman of the committee reported. This was not taxpayer money. This was contributed to the U.S. Government and resided in the Treasury. That figure was justified before the Appropriations Committee.

What the House passed was to continue this program. Therefore, that sum was not a sum that was involved at all in the \$85 million.

All that was asked by the conferees out of the Senate and out of the House was that we pay the fair termination costs, which was to return the airlines their money, and to pay the \$85 million and the \$12 million, which had been justified.

The other body came in 92 to 3 in favor of this.

Many of us who have supported this program said, "With the Senate vote indicating they want to terminate it, as long as the fair termination costs are paid to everyone we will not oppose this." And we did not.

We thought this program should go forward. Instead, what has happened now is that the House has stated:

We will terminate the program; we will not pay back the money to the airlines.

Certain Members are now opposing the chairman, who tries to bring out the figure that was the termination figure.

I think that the House, which voted before to continue this program, has done a shameful thing to the airlines. I shall vote no on this proposal, because I think if you are going to be direct and fair in this matter, and then you terminate it, which it has been stated we will do, that the parties there should be paid. So, Mr. Speaker, I will vote no on this proposal, and I will vote that way for this reason. I think it is a tragic day for us all.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am going to agree with what the gentleman from Washington just said. In discussions here on the floor during the vote, I think I found a number of people who are not familiar with exactly what happened to the airlines.

The airlines were brought into this by the Government and by people urging them to come in to help finance the building of an SST. This money they have paid in was a down payment on aircraft.

They gave this money with the idea that they would be buying an aircraft that would eventually be put into service. This House voted to terminate the SST, which is the aircraft they were going to furnish. There is no aircraft for them to fly, but still their money is down the drain. I would like to point out one further thing. When they receive this \$58 million, or whatever it may be, back, they will pay income tax on the money they receive back, so it is not a full \$58 million. Taxes will be paid on the income out of the Treasury. While I agree with the gentleman about what has happened here today, I say those who would vote

to kill the SST are not now willing to pay the obligation under a contract in two instances, and to pay back the down payment on the aircraft.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say one thing further. Along with the bitterness that I feel at what has happened here, I am a little bitter about those who shot down the SST who are not Members of this Congress or on this floor, but rather the corporate management who, after we passed the SST and had it well on its way, then made wild statements, in my opinion, which had something to do with the defeat of the SST. So, I am not weeping any crocodile tears here today for the contractors, Boeing or GE, but I do feel very badly that we find ourselves in a position where we will not return the funds used for the purchase of the aircraft now that we have shot it down.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman agree that under the circumstances, since the House is unwilling to provide the \$155 million, which included a return of the \$58.5 million to the airlines, that the lower figure of \$97.3 million is certainly justified and that there should be no reasonable question as to the approval of that sum for the liquidation costs?

Mr. BOW. I will say to my distinguished chairman, I am not as enthusiastic about paying this back as I was about paying back that which we took under false pretenses.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The question that comes up is, is this the only remedy for these the companies' people who might be hurt and damaged through the cancellation of these contracts? Under our U.S. court system and under our Constitution, contracts are inviolate. These people have remedies in the courts, and also through Renegotiation Board regular procedure. They can enforce their contract in the courts and these procedures through proper procedures and proof. Why should this Congress at this time of the night suddenly try to determine the amount of the loss when they can go right into a court and find out, and prove item by item. This is a rough foreclosing of regular procedures.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

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

Mr. McFALL. I am not sure what the gentleman from Pennsylvania is talking about, but I would like to have him go back to the microphone, because if what he is saying is what I think he has said, then he is saying the wrong thing.

What this Government did was to make a contract with Boeing and GE that if the Government canceled this contract, they would give them back \$85 million. You say they ought to go to court in order to get their money back. What kind of equity is that?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Now, I will be very glad to answer your question.

Mr. McFALL. Yes, and I would be very happy to hear the answer.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. When there is a valid contract, the determination of the damages and the loss under that contract through its cancellation is for the courts to determine after hearings, and after a determination has been made as to damages.

Therefore, why should we ahead of time try to come up with some sort of inexact estimate that at this point does not seem to me to fit the situation.

I have heard what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations says, and whom I respect very highly and likewise as the gentleman from Ohio says and whom I respect very highly. Why does Congress not let this amendment go out at this time because this does not foreclose them from going into the U.S. courts and enforcing that contract, nor renegotiation procedures for better decisions.

Mr. McFALL. Normally, when the U.S. Government makes a contract with one of its citizens and subsequently decides to cancel that contract, it does not force that citizen to go into court to get his money when the contract is very clear that he is entitled to have his money back.

Now, the \$12 million is the amount necessary for inventory, auditing, and other expenses which the Government will have in respect to this termination. But the \$85 million is due back to GE and Boeing, and I cannot believe that the gentleman is suggesting that these people would have to go into court and sue their Government in order to get back the money they are entitled to under contract.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman does not mean to say that if we turn this amendment down it shuts off these companies so that they cannot go into court and ask for this question to be determined?

Mr. McFALL. Why, of course, they can go into court and sue the Government.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The courts and renegotiation boards are the ones who should be determining the amount involved, not this rushed treatment.

Mr. McFALL. Why anyone would want to further welsh on their contract with a citizen of the United States, is certainly beyond me.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I am not suggesting that we welsh on it at all. I want these contractors and subcontractors to get their full rights. I voted for the SST.

Mr. McFALL. I will say to the gentleman that I think he is suggesting that we welsh on our contract.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, formerly the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, currently a member of the subcommittee, and a member of the conference committee.

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

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the position taken by the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr.

McFALL) as to what our obligation is in paying Boeing and GE. There is no question about our legal obligation. It is a legally binding contract. We owe Boeing and we owe GE for their participation in the program. There is no question about that. With reference to the \$85 million, we requested a ruling from the Comptroller General's Office on the question as to whether or not we were legally bound to pay and the Comptroller General's Office indicated that we are liable for it.

So I think it is totally wrong for the gentleman from Pennsylvania to suggest that GE and Boeing ought to go in to the courts to prove their case. That is wrong.

I do have some question—and I say this with all due respect to my chairman—about the \$12 million. I do not know whether or not the material presented to the committee adequately supports that, but I certainly support the \$85 million that we legally owe to GE and Boeing.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

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

Mr. DELANEY. If the liquidated amount is \$85 million, I see no necessity for an additional \$12 million to find out what the amount is. We have agreed upon the amount. It is \$85 million. Therefore, there is no necessity for this in my opinion.

Mr. MAHON. The administration has asked the Congress for \$85 million, plus the \$12 million for the purpose of terminating this project. This is the request that has come from the Department of Transportation through the Office of Management and Budget from the White House.

Mr. DELANEY. We have already agreed on the amount. It is \$85 million. Therefore, there is no additional expense for which we are liable.

Mr. MAHON. Of course, this is all subject to negotiation and it has to be audited.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further and if the gentleman will pardon me if I say this, the liquidated damages are not subject to negotiation. You agree on the amount. If you cancel the contract, you will pay \$85 million. Therefore, the amount in my opinion should be \$85 million and not \$97 million.

Mr. MAHON. Let me read, Mr. Speaker, from the letter from the General Accounting Office which was quoted in the original House committee report:

The \$97.3 million requested by DOT includes the Government's combined maximum cost share liability to the contractors amounting to \$85.33 million and approximately \$12.0 million in termination costs to close-out the SST program. These costs include such items as inventory transportation, storage and disposition costs, claims from subcontractors, reimbursement for audit assistance from the Defense Contract Audit Agency, and the Defense Contract Administrative Services Region, and DOT's in-house expenses associated with the termination.

So these matters, while they are esti-

mated costs, these matters have to be negotiated and determined.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, there is no necessity of an inventory because in anticipation of this they agreed upon liquidated damages and that is the \$85 million, therefore you cannot increase that amount. And it is up to that corporation to take care of it, no matter what their inventory is or is not, and all their subcontractors, that is the purpose of the \$85 million.

Mr. MAHON. I will say to the gentleman from New York that the U.S. Government has invested some \$864 million in this program with the prime contractor, and innumerable subcontractors, and the Government owns much of this property. There has to be an audit, and there have to be surveys made if the Government is to avoid a catastrophic further loss as a result of the canceling of the contract.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, we are trying to resolve this problem here this evening in order to avoid a payless payday for the postal workers, because the Senate failed to vote on the continuing resolution. It is quite obvious from the debate here now that there is considerable confusion about this whole can of worms involving the SST.

It would seem to me—and I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas—if it is possible, and it would seem to me that it is, that the way to proceed is to set this matter aside, proceed with the supplemental appropriation bill, and then at some subsequent date let the Committee on Appropriations come in with a measure to take care of these closing and phasing out costs? Otherwise, regardless of what we do here, if we approve the amendment now pending before the House the conferees will have to go to the Senate, and if they do not agree we will be here perhaps for the rest of the night, because we are faced with this prospect of payless paydays, and I hate to think that the postal workers are going to not be paid simply because we are hung up on the SST question.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Illinois that the matter has already been considered by the committee and by the House, and it has been considered in the Senate. The \$155 million figure was agreed to in the Senate by a vote of about 92 to 3. The House has just rejected the \$155 million figure. I would hope we can resolve the matter at the level of \$97.3 million, which is, as I said, the original budget request of the President for termination costs, which I explained a few moments ago.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I think we are all in agreement on the \$85 million. What I would like to know is, we

have spent \$800 million or more in this program, so does not the \$800 million that we have invested in this program, that has been invested in equipment, and so forth, does not the equipment that we have invested more than \$800 million in belong to the U.S. Government?

Mr. MAHON. I would say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that yes, most of it does, and it will all belong to the Government after we repay the contractors' cost shares.

Mr. O'NEILL. So it belongs to the U.S. Government.

Now, we had a situation somewhat similar to this in our area where the Watertown Arsenal was closed, and it cost, when the Watertown Arsenal closed, some \$350,000 or \$400,000 to package the equipment that was there, the lathes that belonged to the U.S. Government, to package the missiles that had not been completed, and to put them in a warehouse and store them.

So I would say that since that \$800 million worth of property belongs to the U.S. Government and not to Boeing or General Electric, is it not true that this \$12 million is going to be used to see what the U.S. Government owns, or to see what Boeing owns, or to see what General Electric owns? And when we have determined what we own we will package it up, it belongs to us, and we are going to have to take it out of the factories and put it in warehouses. Is not that what the \$12 million is being used for?

Mr. MAHON. That is part of the cost that is involved here. This property is scattered all over the United States.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HANNA. I just want to make this point and I just want to be sure I understand this. I agree with what the gentleman from Massachusetts has said. It is very clear to me that the \$12 million is not for Boeing. This is for the United States to take care of what it owes.

Mr. MAHON. The \$12 million is not part of the cost share refund to Boeing. It is a separate item.

Mr. HANNA. It is the strategy of the gentleman to suggest that if we put this \$12 million in with the \$85 million that everybody here seems to agree on what we have to pay Boeing that this will look enough better so that we might be able to get the Senate to go along and get the whole thing wiped out tonight.

Mr. MAHON. We are seeking to reach a reasonable settlement of the pending amendment, and it would seem that the \$97.3 million figure may be acceptable.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. It seems to me that some of the Members are confusing two different things here.

We need to keep in mind when we are talking about the Boeing contract, we are talking about a written contract—and that is where the \$85 million comes in.

Then the second thing we are talking

about is the \$12 million expense item to administer the \$85 million item.

There is a third item—and that is the airline money of \$58.5 million. That was in the original motion, which has been voted down.

Now if I should vote for the motion now pending, which involves \$97.3 million; by doing that, would I be saying that we cannot later consider the claims of the airlines? Will that vote completely wind this matter up, or will there be an opportunity later on for the airlines to make their case?

Mr. MAHON. Without a doubt, in my judgment the matter of the \$58.5 million for the airlines will be before the Congress at a later date.

Mr. JONAS. Will there have to be an authorization submitted?

Mr. MAHON. I do not know, but whether there is or not, this matter will be before the Congress, in my judgment.

Mr. JONAS. The reason I ask this question is that the gentleman from Washington surprised me by saying that he was going to vote against this measure, and that he was doing—at least that was what I understand him to say—because he thought it would be a final determination and eliminate any possibility of later considering the claims of the airlines. I would have thought he was very much in error.

Mr. MAHON. I hope the gentleman from Washington will vote for the pending motion for \$97.3 million. As I say, in my judgment the matter of the \$58.5 million will be the subject of later consideration.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAMS. The gentleman stated that maybe sometime in the future, this may be brought up. It is my understanding that this is an obligation to the airlines, that this is the only time we will have it before us unless the Committee on Appropriations through some authorization committee brings it up in some way. What has happened tonight, having killed the SST, and then having voted down the \$155.8 million to terminate it which included the \$55.8 million, we could, therefore, say that we accept the termination. Now with these things hanging, the airlines are way out on a limb. You have foreign airlines and local airlines. If they are not going to be paid as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow) said—of all the people who should get their money back out of this, it is the ones who paid their money in in good faith. They are left—that is why this gentleman will vote, no.

Mr. MAHON. I would say that the legislative committees and the appropriation committees of the House and Senate will, of course, have every opportunity to look into these matters in the future.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I think it ought to be very clear that a vote for the \$97.3 million figure does not mean and it should

not be considered as a vote that ends this entire matter.

Mr. MAHON. In my opinion, it certainly will be before us at a later date.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 59, page 26, line 8, insert:

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL AERONAUTICAL EXPOSITION

For necessary expenses to establish, conduct, and carry out an International Aeronautical Exposition as authorized by section 709 of the Military Construction Authorization Act of 1970, Public Law 91-142, as amended, \$2,600,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation revenues derived from the exposition.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: "In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert '\$2,800,000.'"

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 62, page 27, line 13, insert:

DARIEN GAP HIGHWAY

For necessary expenses for construction of the Darien Gap Highway in accordance with the provisions of section 216 of title 23 of the United States Code, \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 64, page 27, line 21, insert: "to remain available until expended."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 69, page 30, line 18, insert:

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$600,000, to remain available until June 30, 1972.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 84, page 65, line 19, insert:

SEC. 305. For the Post Office Department, any officer having administrative control of an appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization properly chargeable with the costs in fiscal year 1971 of pay increases granted by or pursuant to the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970 and the Postal Reorganization Act, is authorized to transfer thereto, from the unobligated balance of any other appropriation, fund, or authorization under his administrative control and expiring for obligation on June 30, 1971, such amounts as may be necessary for meeting such costs.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the business on this conference report.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report and on the amendments in technical disagreement.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE—FINAL JUDGMENT IN THE CASE OF ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., ET AL. v. JOHN W. McCORMACK, ET AL.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
May 19, 1971.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On this date, I received by hand delivery from Mr. Irwin Goldbloom, Attorney for the Department of Justice a

carbon copy of the Final Judgment in the case of Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., et al. v. John W. McCormack, et al., Civil Action No. 559-67.

The rules and practices of the House of Representatives indicate that no official of the House may respond, either voluntarily or in obedience to such Final Judgment, without the consent of the House being first obtained.

The Final Judgment in question is herewith attached, and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Sincerely,

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

[U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, May 14, 1971]

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, ET AL., PLAINTIFFS,  
V. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, ET AL., DEFENDANTS

(Civil Action No. 559-67)

FINAL JUDGMENT

This matter having come before the Court on remand from the Supreme Court which issued its Opinion and Judgment and this Court having issued an Order on August 29, 1969, which in part gave effect to the Opinion and Judgment of the Supreme Court, it is by the Court this 14th day of May, 1971, as its final judgment in this cause.

Ordered, adjudged and decreed:

1. It is hereby declared and adjudged that Adam Clayton Powell met the qualifications provided by Article I, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States for membership in the House of Representatives in the 90th Congress and was entitled to be seated.

2. Costs in the sum of \$1,363.42, recovery of which has been ordered from the remaining defendants, Jennings, Johnson and Miller, shall be recoverable from them solely in their respective capacities as officer-agents of the House of Representatives of the 90th Congress and not against said defendants Jennings, Johnson and Miller in their individual capacities.

3. Any other claims contained in this cause against the remaining defendants Jennings, Johnson and Miller, jointly or severally, either in their official capacities as officer-agents of the House of Representatives or in their individual capacities be, and they hereby are, denied, for want of prosecution.

(S) HART,  
U.S. District Judge.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have served the foregoing proposed Final Judgment by mailing a copy thereof to plaintiffs' attorney, Herbert O. Reid, Esq., 51 Clifton Avenue, Apartment C-127, Newark, New Jersey, this \_\_\_\_\_ day of May, 1971.

IRWIN GOLDBLOOM,  
Attorney, Department of Justice,  
Washington, D.C.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry, for clarification.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KYL. The House did agree earlier today, did it not, that when it adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, a second in-

quiry for clarification: We will not have any further action on the conference report until Monday, is that correct?

The SPEAKER. That is correct; if action is required by the House.

DOES THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT FOLLOW THE LAW?

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969—Public Law 91-190—requires all Federal agencies to file environmental impact statements before taking "major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment."

The Defense Fuel Supply Center—DFSC—an agency of the Department of Defense, purchases coal for all military and Federal civilian installations, other than TVA, in the United States. One of these installations is the Capitol Powerplant here in Washington, D.C., which supplies power for this Capitol and congressional offices. The DFSC also supplies coal for the Pentagon powerplant.

On March 16, 1971, I asked the DFSC for a report on coal purchases and whether or not that agency is complying with the National Environmental Policy Act.

In a letter dated March 31, 1971, the DFSC furnished a complete report of its coal purchase contracts for 1970. A summary of the report is as follows:

Total number of DFSC contracts	129
Total number of military and Federal installations	159
Total dollar value of coal	\$32,085,472
Total quantity (net tons)	3,439,166
Total surface mined coal (net tons) (33.9%)	1,165,605
Total underground coal (net tons) (66.1%)	2,273,561

In addition, the DFSC told me that, in 1970, it—

Has not prepared any environmental statements as envisioned by section 102 (2) (C) of the National Environmental Policy Act in connection with our coal procurements.

Mr. Speaker, this is a clear violation by the Defense Department of the 1969 law, President Nixon's 1970 Executive Order 11514, and the 1970 and 1971 Guidelines of the Council on Environmental Quality.

Section 102 (2) (C) of the 1969 law requires all Federal agencies to prepare environmental impact statements before taking "major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment." Certainly, contracts calling for the purchase of over 3.4 million tons of coal are "major Federal actions," particularly when we realize that more than one-third of that total is strip mined coal.

There can be no excuse for such violations of the law. The 1969 law was enacted almost 18 months ago. President Nixon himself issued Executive Order 11514 in May 1970 calling on all agencies to establish "policies and procedures" for compliance with it. The CEQ

guidelines of last year and, more recently, of last April make it clear that each agency has an obligation to abide by it. Yet, the Defense Department now violates the law and directives.

On May 12, 1971, I wrote to Secretary Laird about this violation. I observed that several of the 129 contracts will expire in June, July, and August of this year and in the following months. Before new contracts are executed, I urged that the Defense Department, in compliance with the law, prepare effective environmental statements.

Mr. Speaker, the DFSC report shows that many installations are purchasing strip-mined coal to meet their needs. Even an installation of one of the Government's principal environmental agency—the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife of the Interior Department—purchased in 1970, 450 net tons of strip-mined coal for its national fish hatchery in Colorado.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that we spend Federal funds for the protection and propagation of fish and at the same time spend additional Federal funds to buy coal that is mined by methods that result in total destruction of aquatic life and fish in streams filled with sulfuric acid which results from strip mining.

The DFSC told me that it lets the coal operators "ship coal from either a surface or underground mine at their option."

Since it apparently would not create any hardship to the Government, if only underground coal was delivered, I urged Secretary Laird in my letter to abandon this option provision and insist that all coal come from underground coal mines.

Mr. Speaker, through the procurement activities for goods and services by the Federal Government, we can achieve significant environmental controls. Congress recognized this last year when, in the 1970 clean air amendments—Public Law 91-604, December 31, 1970—it directed the President to issue by July 1, 1971, an "order" requiring Federal agencies "to effectuate the purpose and policy" of the Clean Air Act in its grant, loan, and contract programs. A similar provision is included in my bill, H.R. 4556—the Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act of 1971—and in the water pollution legislation introduced by Congressman DINGELL (H.R. 6722) which I have cosponsored.

These provisions would not be necessary, Mr. Speaker, if President Nixon, in issuing his Executive Order 11507—35 Federal Register 2573—of February 4, 1970, had not repealed that portion of former President Johnson's Executive Orders 11288 and 11282 of 1966 which directed agencies to control air and water pollution from activities financed under Federal loans, grants, and contracts. The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970 filled this void for air pollution, but it has not yet been done for water.

The administrative action taken by President Johnson does indicate that such action could also be taken by an agency head in consonance with various congressional policies. This is particularly true when we consider the mandates of the National Environmental Pol-

icy Act of 1969 and the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969.

In this connection, I wrote to Secretary Laird:

Even in the case of underground coal purchases, the Defense Department's contracts should specify that the coal operator shall comply with the requirements of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and applicable State and local air and water pollution control laws. Failure to comply would result in the suspension or termination of the contract. Such a provision is, of course, required under the 1970 amendments to the Clean Air Act. I believe that it should be expanded to cover these other areas as well, and that it should be included in all future coal purchase contracts.

My letter to the Secretary and the DFSC report follow:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., May 12, 1971.

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD,  
Secretary of Defense,  
Department of Defense,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY LAIRD: On March 31, 1971, the Defense Fuel Supply Center (DFSC) transmitted to me a report which I requested concerning that agency's purchase of coal during calendar year 1970 "for military and

Federal civil agencies" other than the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The data indicates that the DFSC entered into 129 contracts to purchase over 3.4 million net tons of coal for 159 Government installations. This coal is valued at more than \$32 million. More than one-third of the coal is surfaced mined.

The data also indicates that more than 3.3 million net tons will probably be purchased in 1972.

In the letter of transmittal, the Acting Commander of the Center said:

"The Defense Fuel Supply Center has not prepared any environmental statements as envisioned by section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 in connection with our coal procurements."

This is a clear violation by the Defense Department of the 1969 law, Executive Order 11514, and the Guidelines of the Council on Environmental Quality.

Several contracts for the purchase of coal will expire in June, July, and August of this year. Before these new contracts are executed, I believe that your Department, in compliance with the law, should prepare effective environmental statements in accordance with the Executive Order and the C.E.Q.'s Guidelines.

The letter also indicates that the contract permits the suppliers to "ship product [coal] from either a surface or underground mine at its option." Since the Defense Department does not specify that some surface mine coal

must be delivered, it apparently would not create any hardship to the Government to specify that all coal delivered under its contracts come from underground coal mines. I urge that your Department take this action now.

Surface mining of coal has vast detrimental effects to our environment that cannot be overcome. In many cases, surface coal operators mine coal in a manner that is totally inconsistent with even the minimum regulatory guidelines set forth in the Administration's surface mine legislation proposed by Secretary Morton last February. The Government should take the lead in its own purchases of coal to insist that the environment is not degraded.

Even in the case of underground coal purchases, the Defense Department's contracts should specify that the coal operator shall comply with the requirements of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and applicable State and local air and water pollution control laws. Failure to comply would result in the suspension or termination of the contract. Such a provision is, of course, required under the 1970 amendments to the Clean Air Act. I believe that it should be expanded to cover these other areas as well, and that it should be included in all future coal purchase contracts.

Sincerely,

KEN HECHLER.

DEFENSE FUEL SUPPLY CENTER COAL PURCHASES, JAN. 1, 1970 TO DEC. 31, 1970  
PROGRAM/REGION 1 (MAINE, MASSACHUSETTS, NEW YORK, VERMONT)

Contract number and date, DSA600-	Installation	Contractor	Contract term	Quantity (net tons)	Total cost for coal	Type of mine	Location of mine	Estimated	Require-
								(net tons)	ment
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	1972	1973
								(9)	(10)
70-D-0191, 14 May 1970	VAC, Bath, N.Y.	Pittston	July 1970-September 1971	7,300	\$71,175	U	Meriden, West Va.	0	0
70-D-1516, 26 June 1970	Boston Naval Shipyard, Mass.	do	August-September 1970	2,600	26,000	U	do	0	0
71-D-0191, 14 May 1970	Federal Office Building, Buffalo, N.Y.	do	July 1970-September 1971	900	8,775	U	do	0	0
71-D-0191, 14 May 1970	VAH, Castle Point, N.Y.	do	do	1,800	17,550	U	do	1,000	0
71-D-0180, 29 July 1970	Caswell AFS, Maine	Foreston	August 1970-August 1971	500	5,250	U	North Apollo, Pa.		
71-D-0168, 4 Aug. 1970	do	Boone County	August-October 1970	500	5,600	U	Monclo, West Va.		
Total Caswell Requirement, 1,000 tons								0	0
71-D-0168, 4 Aug. 1970	Charleston AFS, Maine	Boone County	August-October 1970	2,700	29,700	U	Monclo, West Va.	2,700	2,700
71-D-0204, 15 Oct. 1970	Fort Devens, Mass.	Foreston	October 1970-September 1971	6,000	66,000	U	North Apollo, Pa.	6,000	3,000
71-D-0204, 15 Oct. 1970	Griffiss AFB, N.Y.	do	do	22,900	286,250	S	Grampian and Patton, Pa.		
70-D-0192, 6 May 1970	do	Crown	July 1970-September 1971	25,500	255,000	U	Avonmore, Pa.		
77-D-0177, 19 Aug. 1970	do	Foreston	August-September 1970	2,600	31,200	S	Grampian, Pa.		
71-D-0169, 16 July 1970	do	Crown	July 1970-September 1971	500	8,500	U	Maysville, Pa.		
Total Griffiss requirement, 51,500 tons								41,000	41,000
71-D-0169, 16 July 1970	Hancock Field, N.Y.	Crown	July 1970-September 1971	4,500	76,500	U	Maysville, Pa.	4,000	4,000
71-D-0169, 16 July 1970	Lockport AFS, N.Y.	do	do	2,400	40,800	U	do	0	0
71-D-0168, 4 Aug. 1970	Loring AFB, Maine	Boone County	August-October 1970	10,000	110,000	U	Monclo, West Va.	12,000	12,000
71-D-0171, 4 Aug. 1970	Montauk AFS, N.Y.	do	October 1970-September 1971	700	8,050	U	do	0	0
71-D-0171, 4 Aug. 1970	North Truro AFS, Mass.	do	August 1970-September 1971	1,800	20,700	U	do	0	0
71-D-0209, 16 Nov. 1970	Otis AFB, Mass.	do	March-April 1971	12,000	150,500	U	do		
71-D-0171, 4 Aug. 1970	do	do	August 1970-September 1971	6,000	69,000	U	do		
Total Otis requirement, 18,000 tons								18,000	18,000
71-D-0169, 16 July 1970	St. Albans AFS, Vt.	Crown	July 1970-September 1971	2,400	40,800	U	Maysville, Pa.	0	0
71-D-0169, 16 July 1970	Saratoga AFS, N.Y.	do	do	1,400	23,800	U	do	1,100	1,100
71-D-0169, 16 July 1970	Waterdown AFS, N.Y.	do	do	1,200	20,400	U	do	0	0
71-D-0192, 6 May 1970	Westover AFB, Mass.	do	do	12,500	125,000	U	Avonmore, Pa.	0	0

## PROGRAM/REGION 2 (MARYLAND, NEW JERSEY, PENNSYLVANIA, VIRGINIA AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA)

Contract number and date, DSA600-	Installation	Contractor	Contract term	Quantity (net tons)	Total cost for coal	Type of mine	Location of mine	Estimated (net tons)	
								1972	1973
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
70-D-1509, 18 June 1970	VAH, Altoona, Pa.	Bradford	July 1970-July 1971	455	3,576	U.S.1	Bigler, Pa.		
70-D-1510, 18 June 1970	do.	Foreston	do.	900	8,640	U	North Apollo, Pa.		
70-D-0193, 22 Apr. 1970	do.	Bradford	do.	455	3,572	U.S.1	Bigler, Pa.		
Total VAH, Altoona requirement, 2,720 tons								3,100	3,100
71-D-0196, 17 June 1970	U.S.N.T.C., Bainbridge, Md.	Hooversville	August 1970-July 1971	8,000	80,000	U	Coal Mt., W. Va.	11,500	11,500
71-D-0162, 4 Aug. 1970	Cape Charles AFS, Va.	Boone County	December 1970-July 1971	800	92,000	U	Monclo, W. Va.	870	870
70-D-1511, 30 June 1970	Capitol Powerplant, Wash., D.C.	Island Creek	July 1970-July 1971	19,500	217,425	U	Stowe, W. Va.		
70-D-0195, 10 July 1970	do.	do.	do.	16,000	160,000	U	Coal Mt., W. Va.		
Total Capitol Powerplant requirement, 35,500 tons								35,000	35,000
70-D-0199, 18 June 1970	Carlisle Barracks, Pa.	Pittston	August 1970-July 1971	8,500	83,375	U	Meridan, W. Va.	7,000	7,000
70-D-0195, 10 July 1970	Naval Supply Center, Cheatham Annex, Williamsburg, Va.	(No purchase in 1970).						280	280
70-D-0195, 10 July 1970	Central Heating Plant, Washington, D.C.	Island Creek	July 1970-July 1971	90,000	900,000	U	Coal Mt., West Va.		
70-D-1511, 30 June 1970	do.	do.	do.	30,000	334,500	U	Stowe, West Va.		
Total central heating plant requirement, 120,000 tons								120,000	120,000
71-D-0175, 21 Aug. 1970	Ft. Dix, N.J.	Boone County	October 1970-July 1971	6,300	72,450	U	Monclo, West Va.	12,500	10,000
71-D-0173, 17 Aug. 1970	Ft. Eustis, Va.	General	August 1970-June 1971	3,000	33,000	U	Hampton Mines, West Va.		
71-D-0205, 23 Oct. 1970	do.	Pittston	October 1970-December 1970	5,000	70,000	U.S.1	Lorado, West Va.		
71-D-0175, 21 Aug. 1970	do.	Boone County	December 1970-July 1971	9,000	104,700	U	Monclo, West Va.		
Total, Fort Eustis requirement, 22,000 tons								15,000	15,000
71-D-0211, 27 Nov. 1970	GSA FSS Region 3, Washington, D.C.	Island Creek	November 1970-October 1971	100,000	1,590,000	U	Allingdale, Tioga, Stowe, and Coal Mt., West Va.		
71-D-0212, 3 Nov. 1970	do.	Pittston	November 1970-July 1971	25,000	362,500	U	Dunlap, Ky., Lorado, West Va., Panther Gluch, W. Va.		
GSA Region 3, 1970 combined purchases, 125,000 tons								0	0
70-D-0195, 10 July 1970	GSA Fuel Yard No. 1, Washington, D.C.	Island Creek	July 1970-July 1971	62,000	629,075	U	Amherstdale, West Va.		
70-D-1511, 30 June 1970	do.	do.	do.	9,000	105,300	U	Stowe, West Va.		
Total GSA Fuel Yard No. 1 requirement, 71,000 tons								100,000	50,000
71-D-0164, 28 July 1970	VAC, Hampton, Va.	Boone County	August 1970-July 1971	9,000	99,000	U	Monclo, W. Va.	8,600	0
70-D-0184, 11 June 1970	VAH, Ft. Howard, Md.	Pittston	July 1970-July 1971	3,140	39,825	U	Marybill, W. Va.	3,000	3,000
71-D-0181, 7 Aug. 1970	Fort Lee, Va.	Island Creek	August 1970-July 1971	2,400	39,600	U	Mabley, W. Va.		
71-D-0170, 28 July 1970	do.	General Coal	July 1970-June 1971	1,500	16,500	U	Hampton Mines, W. Va.		
Total Fort Lee requirement, 3,900 tons								4,800	0
70-D-0199, 8 June 1970	Letterkenny AD, Pa.	Pittston	August 1970-May 1971	13,000	58,500	U	Meridan, W. Va.		
70-D-1512, 19 June 1970	do.	Foreston	August 1970-July 1971	1,200	11,700	U	Johnstown, Pa.		
Total Letterkenny requirement, 14,200 tons								13,500	9,000
70-D-0195, 10 July 1970	Department of Corrections, Lorton, Va.	Island Creek	July 1970-July 1971	7,000	73,850	U	Coal Mt. W. Va.		
70-D-1511, 30 June 1970	do.	Island Creek	do.	9,000	105,300	U	Stowe, W. Va.		
Total Lorton requirement, 16,000 tons								20,800	20,800
71-D-0176, 4 Aug. 1970	McGuire AFB, N.J.	Boone County	December 1970-July 1971	8,360	91,960	U	Monclo, W. Va.		
71-D-0172, 20 Aug. 1970	do.	General	October 1970-June 1971	17,500	194,500	U	Hampton Mines, W. Va.		
Total McGuire requirement, 25,860 tons								0	0
70-D-1511, 30 June 1970	Pentagon Heating Plant, Washington, D.C.	Island Creek	July 1970-July 1971	23,500	262,025	U	Stowe, W. Va.		
70-D-0195, 10 July 1970	do.	do.	do.	35,500	355,000	U	Coal Mt., W. Va.		
Total Pentagon requirement, 59,000 tons								57,000	57,000

Footnote at end of tables.

Contract number and date, DSA600— (1)	Installation (2)	Contractor (3)	Contract term (4)	Quantity (net tons) (5)	Total cost for coal (6)	Type of mine (7)	Location of mine (8)	Estimated	Require-
								(net tons) 1972 (9)	ment 1973 (10)
71-D-0208, 23 Oct. 1970	Picatinny Arsenal, N.J.	Island Creek	October 1970-June 1971	16,600	243,190	U	Allingdale, Tioga, W. Va.		
71-D-0181, 7 Aug. 1970	do	do	August 1970-July 1971	13,400	221,100	U	Mabley, W. Va.		
Total Picatinny requirement, 30,000 tons.								30,000	30,000
70-D-0194, 21 Apr. 1970	VAH, Pittsburgh, Pa.	Crown	July 1970-July 1971	10,550	110,775	U	Maysville, Pa.	0	0
70-D-0157, 21 Jan. 1970	Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Va.	Logan & Kanawha	August 1970-July 1971	26,000	208,000	U	Tomlinson, W. Va.	30,000	30,000
71-D-0181, 7 Aug. 1970	Radford AAP, Cowan, Va.	Island Creek	September 1970-July 1971	14,200	241,400	U	Mabley, W. Va.		
71-D-0175, 21 Aug. 1970	do	Boone County	do	5,800	67,140	U	Monclo, W. Va.		
Total Radford requirement, 20,000 tons.								20,000	20,000
70-D-0169, 27 Jan. 1970	Radford AAP, Pepper, Va.	Logan & Kanawha	February-April 1970	18,000	144,000	U	Home Creek, Va.		
71-D-0174, 4 Aug. 1970	do	Eastern Associated	August 1970-July 1971	60,000	750,000	U	Kopperston, W. Va.		
71-D-0195, 27 Oct. 1970	do	Logan & Kanawha	November 1970-July 1971	120,000	1,800,000	U	Home Creek, Va.		
71-D-0187, 19 Aug. 1970	do	do	August 1970-October 1970	25,000	375,000	U	do		
71-D-0188, 18 Aug. 1970	do	Eastern Associated	do	10,000	165,000	U	Putt, W. Va.		
Total Radford requirement, 233,000 tons.								230,000	200,000
71-D-0162, 4 Aug. 1970	DGSC, Richmond, Va.	Boone County	November 1970-July 1971	5,000	56,250	U	Monclo, W. Va.	5,000	5,000
70-D-0184, 11 Jan. 1970	VAH, Salem, Va.	Pittston	July 1970-July 1971	7,550	82,675	U	Clinchfield, Va.	5,000	0
70-D-0195, 10 July 1970	W. Central Heating Plant, Washington, D.C.	Island Creek	do	35,000	350,000	U	Coal Mt., W. Va.		
70-D-1511, 30 June 1970	do	do	do	41,000	457,150	U	Stowe, W. Va.		
Total W. Central requirement, 76,000 tons.								100,000	100,000
71-D-0162, 4 Aug. 1970	N.W.S., Yorktown, Va.	Boone County	August 1970-July 1971	1,940	22,310	U	Monclo, W. Va.	1,980	0
	N.O.S., Indianhead, Md.	(No purchase in 1970)						2,000	2,000
	Fort George G. Meade, Md.	do						500	0

PROGRAM/REGION 3 (ALABAMA, EAST TENNESSEE, GEORGIA, NORTH CAROLINA, SOUTH CAROLINA, OHIO, EAST KENTUCKY AND WEST VIRGINIA)

71-D-0215, 27 Nov. 1970	Anniston AD, Ala.	Franklin	November 1970-January 1971	2,800	37,100	S	Sunlight, Crosston, Ala.	14,000	14,000
70-D-0153, 7 Jan. 1970	Arnold AFS, Tenn.	Elgin	July 1970-March 1971	20,000	140,000	U	Whitwell, Tenn.	20,000	20,000
70-D-0179, 11 Mar. 1970	Atlanta AD, Ga.	Scotia	April 1970-March 1971	2,800	25,200	U	Scot, Ky.	2,800	2,500
70-D-0187, 25 Mar. 1970	Fort Benning, Ga.	do	do	700	6,300	U	do	8,000	5,000
70-D-0166, 27 Feb. 1970	Fort Bragg N.C.	Logan & Kanawha	do	6,300	59,850	U	Tomlinson, W. Va.		
70-D-0177, 18 Mar. 1970	do	Island Creek	do	28,500	256,500	U	Stowe, Kelly, W. Va.		
Total Fort Bragg requirement, 34,800 tons.								39,600	25,000
71-D-0163, 23 July 1970	VAH, Chillicothe, Ohio	Peabody	July 1970-March 1971	5,400	27,000	U	New Lexington, Ohio	0	0
71-D-0162, 4 Aug. 1970	Charleston AFB, S.C.	Boone County	November 1970-March 1971	7,000	77,000	U	Monclo, W. Va.		
71-D-0168, 30 Jan. 1970	do	Logan & Kanawha	July 1970-March 1971	7,000	55,300	U	Earling, W. Va.		
Total Charleston requirement, 8,000 tons.								17,600	17,600
	Charleston Naval Shipyard (No Annual Purchase in 1970)							41,000	41,000
70-D-0161, 4 Feb. 1970	NASA, Cleveland, Ohio	Midvale	July 1970-March 1971	7,000	49,700	U	Midvale, Ohio	1,000	1,000
70-D-0175, 13 Mar. 1970	Clinton County AFB, Ohio	N&W Sales	do	5,500	27,500	S	Clay Ohio		
71-D-0224, 14 Jan. 1970	do	do	April 1971-March 1972	7,400	55,500	S	do		
Total Clinton County Requirement, 12,900 tons.								7,400	7,400
70-D-0174, 27 Mar. 1970	Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse, Columbus, Ohio.	Mercer	July 1970-March 1971	1,200	10,800	U	Leatherwood, Ky.	1,200	0
70-D-0146, 7 Jan. 1970	DCSC, Columbus, Ohio	Peabody	April 1970-March 1971	19,500	99,450	U	New Lexington, Ohio	25,000	25,000
70-D-0178, 13 Mar. 1970	VAC, Dayton, Ohio	Blue Diamond	July 1970-March 1971	8,500	74,375	U	Leatherwood No 1, Ky.	11,600	4,000
71-D-0183, 20 Feb. 1970	DESC, Ohio	U.S. Fuel	August 1970-March 1971	12,000	62,400	U	Hiawatha, Utah	12,800	12,800
70-D-0172, 20 Feb. 1970	Fort Gordon, Ga.	Blue Diamond	April 1970-March 1971	4,200	36,750	U	Leatherwood, Ky.		
70-D-0179, 11 Mar. 1970	do	Scotia	do	2,500	21,250	U	Scot, Ky.		
70-D-0187, 25 Mar. 1970	do	do	do	300	2,700	U	do		
Total Fort Gordon requirement, 7,000 tons.								12,800	10,000

PROGRAM REGION 3 (ALABAMA, EAST TENNESSEE, GEORGIA, NORTH CAROLINA, SOUTH CAROLINA, OHIO, EAST KENTUCKY AND WEST VIRGINIA)—Continued

Contract number and date, DSA600—	Installation	Contractor	Contract term	Quantity (net tons)	Total cost for coal	Type of mine	Location of mine	Esti- mated	Require- ment
								(net tons)	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	1972	1973
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
70-D-0186, 27 Mar. 1970	Holston AAP, Tenn.	Pittston	April 1970—March 1971.	240,000	2,520,000	U	Clinchfield, Va.	263,000	250,000
70-D-0187, 25 Mar. 1970	Hunter AFB, Ga.	Scotia	do	200	1,800	U	Scot, Ky.	0	0
70-D-0179, 11 Mar. 1970	Fort Jackson, S.C.	do	do	4,750	40,375	U	do		
70-D-0166, 27 Feb. 1970	do	Logan & Kanawha	do	700	6,650	U	Earling, W. Va.		
70-D-0172, 20 Feb. 1970	do	Blue Diamond	do	6,200	54,250	U	Leatherwood, Ky.		
Total Fort Jackson requirement, 11,650 tons								18,800	15,000
71-D-0162, 4 Aug. 1970	Seymour Johnson AFB, N.C.	Boone County	November 1970—March 1971.	5,000	55,000	U	Monclo, W. Va.		
70-D-0158, 30 Jan. 1970	do	Scotia	July 1970—March 1971.	3,000	25,500	U	Scot, Ky.		
70-D-0155, 12 Jan. 1970	do	Island Creek	do	5,000	37,500	U	Kelly, Stowe, W. Va.		
Total Seymour Johnson requirement, 13,000 tons								13,000	13,000
MCB, Camp Lejeune, N.C. (No purchase in 1970)								30,000	30,000
70-D-0176, 11 Mar. 1970	Lexington Blue Grass AD, Lexington Ky.	Blue Diamond	April 1970—March 1971.	8,700	76,125	U	Leatherwood, Ky.	8,600	8,000
70-D-0176, 11 Mar. 1970	do	do	do	1,000	8,750	U	do	600	0
70-D-0163, 19 Feb. 1970	Lockbourne AFB, Ohio	Peabody	July 1970—March 1971.	37,000	185,000	U	New Lexington, Ohio		
71-D-0225	do	do	Apr. 1971—March 1972.	40,000	360,000	U	do		
Total Lockbourne requirement 77,000 tons								40,000	40,000
71-D-0162, 4 Aug. 1970	VAC Martinsburg, W. Va.	Boone County	August 1970—March 1971.	5,100	56,100	U	Monclo, W. Va.	10,000	10,000
70-D-0146, 7 Jan. 1970	Ravenna AAP, Ohio	Peabody	April 1970—March 1971.	3,300	18,150	S	Arnold, Ohio	3,450	3,000
71-D-0222, 11 Dec. 1970	Redstone Arsenal, Ala.	Franklin	December 1970—June 1971.	18,925	269,681	S	Jasper, Ala.		
71-D-0223, 11 Dec. 1970	do	Reid and Hallmark	December 1970—March 1971.	18,520	175,940	S	Branford, Ala.		
Total Redstone purchase 37,445 tons—No annual purchase in 1970, this represents repurchase against defaulted contract								102,000	100,000
Fort Rucker, Ala. (No annual purchase.)								6,600	3,000
70-D-0171, 27 Feb. 1970	Fort Stewart, Ga.	Island Creek	April 1970—March 1971.	9,200	82,800	U	Stowe, Kelley, W. Va.		
70-D-0187, 25 Mar. 1970	do	Scotia	do	350	3,150	U	Scot, Ky.		
Total Fort Stewart requirement, 9,550 tons								1,755	0
71-D-0163 23 July 1970	Wright-Patterson AFB Ohio	Peabody	July 1970—September 1970.	7,500	38,250	U, S <sup>1</sup>	New Lexington, Ohio Drakes, Ohio.		
71-D-0179 3 Aug. 1970	do	U.S. Fuel	August 1970—March 1971.	12,000	67,200	U	Hiawatha, Utah		
71-D-0183 14 Aug. 1970	do	do	do	103,600	524,440	U	do		
Total Wright-Patterson requirement, 130,600 tons								123,000	123,000
Fed. Ref. for Women, Alderson, W. Va. (No purchase in 1970).								3,500	3,500
VAH, Brecksville, Ohio								9,600	3,000
Youngstown Munic. Airport, Ohio								2,300	2,300
VAH, Salisbury, N.C.								4,000	0

## PROGRAM/REGION 4 (MICHIGAN, MINNESOTA, AND WISCONSIN)

70-D-0160, 4 Feb. 1970	Battle Creek Federal Center, Mich.	Island Creek	July 1970—April 1971.	5,000	43,500	U	Kelly, W. Va.	2,700	0
70-D-0162, 16 Feb. 1970	Calumet AFS, Mich.	James Pickands	do	1,300	12,350	U	Earling, W. Va.	0	0
70-D-0159, 23 Jan. 1970	Custer, AFS, Mich.	Blue Diamond	do	430	3,615	U	Leatherwood, Ky.	0	0
70-D-0166, 27 Feb. 1970	Detroit, Arsenal Mich.	Logan & Kanawha	May 1970—April 1971.	28,900	260,100	U	Earling, W. Va.	28,700	28,700
70-D-0164, 23 Mar. 1970	Duluth International Airport, Minn.	C. Reiss	July 1970—March 1971.	6,000	54,000	U	do	7,100	7,100
70-D-0164, 23 Mar. 1970	Finland AFS, Minn.	do	July 1970—April 1971.	700	6,300	U	do	900	900
70-D-0164, 23 Mar. 1970	Finley AFS, Minn.	do	do	1,300	12,090	U	do	1,400	1,400
70-D-0164, 23 Mar. 1970	Kincheloe, AFB Mich.	do	do	6,000	52,500	U	do		
70-D-0182, 17 Aug. 1970	do	do	October 1970—April 1971.	11,000	110,000	U	Hebe, Sassafras, Emmons, Ky.		
Total Kincheloe requirement, 17,000 tons								20,000	20,000
70-D-0166, 27 Feb. 1970	Michigan AMP, Mich.	Logan & Kanawha	May 1970—April 1971	24,000	219,600	U	Tomlinson, W. Va.	23,000	23,000
70-D-0160, 4 Feb. 1970	VAH, Saginaw, Mich.	Island Creek	July 1970—April 1971	950	8,265	U	Kelly, W. Va.	900	900
70-D-0164, 23 Mar. 1970	Sault Sainte Marie, AFS, Mich.	C. Reiss	do	900	8,100	U	Earling, W. Va.	1,400	1,400
70-D-1517, 4 July 1970	K. I. Sawyer AFB, Mich.	do	do	21,300	213,000	U	Hebe, Sassafras, Emmons, Ky.	14,000	14,000
70-D-0157, 21 Jan. 1970	Selfridge AFB, Mich.	Logan & Kanawha	do	9,500	85,500	U	Earling, W. Va.	10,000	10,000
70-D-0164, 23 Mar. 1970	VAH, St. Cloud, Minn.	C. Reiss	do	900	8,235	U	do	0	0
70-D-0164, 23 Mar. 1970	Wadena AFS, Minn.	do	do	800	7,440	U	do	0	0
70-D-0165, 6 Mar. 1970	VAC, Wood, Wisc.	Hometown	do	7,200	63,000	U	Slagle, W. Va.	7,200	7,200

Footnote at end of tables.

Contract number and date, DSA600-- (1)	Installation (2)	Contractor (3)	Contract term (4)	Quantity (net tons) (5)	Total cost for coal (6)	Type of mine (7)	Location of mine (8)	Estimated	Require-
								(net tons) 1972 (9)	ment 1973 (10)
70-D-0159, 23 Jan. 1970	Wurtsmith AFB, Mich	Blue Diamond	July 1970—April 1971	7,000	60,900	U	Leatherwood No. 1, Ky		
70-D-0170, 16 Feb. 1970	do	Lagan & Kanawha	do	7,000	64,260	U	Tomlinson, W. Va		
Total Wurtsmith requirement, 14,000 tons.								0	0
	Empire AFS, Mich. (No purchase in 1970).							1,500	1,500
PROGRAM/REGION 5 (INDIANA, ILLINOIS, IOWA, KANSAS, MISSOURI, SOUTH DAKOTA, WEST TENNESSEE, WEST KENTUCKY, WISCONSIN)									
70-D-1492, 19 June 1970	Antigo AFS, Wis.	C. Reiss	July 1970—November 1971	1,240	12,400	U	Earling, W. Va	1,200	1,200
71-D-0198, 8 Oct. 1970	Badger AAP, Baraboo, Wis.	Peabody	December 1970—November 1971	30,500	167,750	U	Price, Utah		
70-D-0197, 16 Oct. 1970	do	Island Creek	do	46,250	601,250	U, S	Holden, Scarlet Glen and Emmett, W. Va.		
71-D-0192, 22 Oct. 1970	do	Kirpatrick	do	67,000	519,250	S	Wright and Caney Creek, Ky.		
70-D-0173, 25 Feb. 1970	do	Island Creek	March 1970—May 1970.	30,000	180,000	S	Shamrock, Ky.		
Total Badger AAP requirement; 220,000 tons.								0	0
70-D-0196, 17 Sept. 1970	Fort Campbell, Ky.	Hooversville	December 1970—November 1971.	7,100	69,980	U	Brier Creek and Fies, Ky.	7,000	5,000
70-D-1494, 26 June 1970	Chanute AFB, Ill.	Bell and Zoller	July 1970—November 1971.	68,800	481,600	U	Murdock, Ill.	50,000	50,000
70-D-0200, 17 July 1970	VAH, Danville, Ill.	American Metal Climax.	do	15,920	111,440	S	Latta, Ind.	11,400	11,400
71-D-0193, 24 Sept. 1970	Granite City AD, Ill.	Kiesel	December 1970—November 1971.	4,300	26,445	U, S	Millstadt, Freeburg, Marissa, Ill.		
Total Granite City AD requirement, 8,600 tons.								8,000	5,000
70-D-1487, 18 Jun 1970	Grisson AFB, Ind.	Peabody	July 1970—November 1971.	35,000	183,750	S	Suntec Spur, Ind.	24,500	24,500
71-D-0201, 25 Sept. 1970	Ft. Benjamin Harrison, Ind.	Ernest Johnson	December 1970—September 1971.	20,000	135,000	S	Latta, Ind.	15,000	10,000
70-D-1488, 2 June 1970	VAC, Hot Springs, S.D.	Big Horn	July 1970—November 1970.	6,555	32,447	S	Sheridan, Wyo	5,000	5,000
71-D-0192, 22 Oct. 1970	Iowa AAP, Burlington, Iowa	Kirkpatrick	November 1970—October 1971.	24,000	186,000	S	Caney Creek, Ky		
71-D-0214, 24 Dec. 1970	do	United Electric	January 1971—November 1971.	26,000	188,500	S	Canton, Ill.		
Total Iowa AAP requirement, 50,000 tons.								50,000	50,000
71-D-0200, 12 Oct. 1970	Joliet AAP, Ill.	Peabody	March 1971—November 1971.	45,000	247,500	U	Price, Utah		
71-D-0202, 9 Oct. 1970	do	North American	December 1970—February 1971.	15,000	91,500	U	Castle Gate, Utah		
71-D-0203, 12 Oct. 1970	do	American Metal Climax.	November 1970—September 1971.	60,000	390,000	S	Delta, Ill.		
Total Joliet requirement, 120,000 tons.								120,000	120,000
70-D-0197, 16 Oct. 1970	Ft. Knox, Ky.	Island Creek	December 1970—November 1971.	20,000	198,000	U	Brier Creek and Fies, Ky.		
71-D-0192, 22 Oct. 1970	do	do	March 1971—October 1971.	26,000	214,500	S	Caney Creek, Ky		
Total Fort Knox requirement, 46,000 tons.								40,000	20,000
71-D-0194, 8 Oct. 1970	Kansas AAP, Kans.	Bill's	December 1970—November 1971.	5,000	39,250	S	Welch, Okla.		
70-D-0181, 23 Mar. 1970	do	do	July 1970—November 1970.	800	4,480	S	do		
Total Kansas requirement 5,800 tons.								5,000	5,000
70-D-1480, 26 May 1970	VAH, Marion, Ill.	Barbara Kay	July 1970—November 1971.	1,900	15,580	U	Marion, Ill.	0	0
70-D-1513, 30 June 1970	U.S. Penitentiary, Marion, Ill.	Freeman	July 1970—December 1970.	5,200	37,700	U	Orient No. 4, Ill.	3,500	3,500
71-D-0199, 1 Oct 1970	Camp McCoy, Wis.	Plateau	December 1970—November 1971.	5,400	28,080	U	Wattis, Utah	8,000	5,000
71-D-0192, 22 October 1970	Milan AAP, Tenn	Island Creek	do	21,100	163,525	S	Caney Creek, Ky	20,000	20,000
70-D-1486, 27 May 1970	VAH, Murfreesboro, Tenn.	Alley-Cassety	July 1971—November 1971.	9,300	64,170	S	do	0	0
71-D-0178 2 August 1970	O'Hare Intl Arpt, Ill.	U.S. fuel	August 1970—November 1971.	9,000	44,100	U	Haiwatha, Utah	8,000	8,000
Rock Island Arsenal, Ill. (No purchases made in 1970)								50,000	50,000
70-D-1493, 19 June 1970	Osceola AFS, Wisc.	Great Lakes	July 1970—November 1971.	1,200	8,100	U	Harrisburg, Ill.	1,200	1,200
70-D-1496, 26 June 1970	Scott AFB, Ill	Kiesel	do	29,600	204,240	U	Belleville, Ill.	27,000	27,000
71-D-0194, 8 Oct. 1970	Sunflower AAP, Kans.	Bill's	December 1970—November 1971.	20,000	153,800	S	Welch, Okla.	0	0
70-D-1495, 9 June 1970	Terre Haute PMDS, Ind.	Mt. Pleasant	July 1970—November 1971.	900	6,345	U	Terre Haute, Ind.	0	0
70-D-1487, 18 June 1970	U.S. Penitentiary, Terre Haute, Ind.	Peabody	July 1970—November 1970.	10,000	54,500	S	Sandborn, Ind.	0	0
71-D-0210, 7 Dec. 1970	Ft. Leonard Wood, Mo.	Bill's	December 1970—November 1971.	14,000	120,400	S	Welch, Okla.	14,000	10,000

## PROGRAM/REGION 6 (ARIZONA, CALIFORNIA, COLORADO, IDAHO, OREGON, UTAH, WASHINGTON, WYOMING)

Contract number and date, DSA600-	Installation	Contractor	Contract term	Quantity (net tons)	Total cost for coal	Type of mine	Location of mine	Estimated (net tons)		Requirement
								1972	1973	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	
71-D-0167, 2 July 1979	Blaine AFS, Wash	Morris & Sons	July 1970-September 1971	1,800	11,610	U	Hiawatha, Utah	1,100		1,100
71-D-0189, 11 Sept. 1970	Fort Carson, Colo.	Corley	October 1970-September 1971	11,000	77,000	S	Florence, Colo.	0		0
70-D-1505, 24 June 1970	Curlew Civilian Conservation Center, Curlew, Wash.	Continental	July 1970-September 1971	700	4,795	U	Hiawatha, Utah	0		0
70-D-1490, 15 Jan 1970	Hill AFB, Utah	U.S. Fuel	do	1,200	5,676	U	do	0		0
70-D-1490, 15 Jan. 1979	Kingsley Field, Utah	do	do	6,200	29,326	U	do	6,000		6,000
71-D-0166, 2 July 1970	National Fish Hatchery, Leadville, Colo.	Pittsburg and Midway	do	450	2,399	S	Oak Ridge, Colo.	0		0
70-D-0180, 12 Mar. 1970	Lowry AFB, Colo.	Imperial	April-May 1970	2,941	16,028	U	Erie, Colo.			
71-D-0165, 2 July 1970	do	do	July 1970-September 1971	2,200	17,270	U	do			
71-D-0166, 2 July 1970	do	Pittsburg and Midway	do	18,500	84,925	S	Oak Ridge, Colo.			
Total Lowry requirement, 23,641 tons.								16,500		16,500
71-D-0167, 2 July 1970	McChord AFB, Wash	Morris & Sons	July 1970-September 1971	22,800	108,984	U	Hiawatha, Utah	20,000		20,000
70-D-1490, 15 Jan. 1970	Mt. Home AFB, Idaho	U.S. Fuel	do	17,500	82,250	U	do	17,500		17,500
70-D-1504, 19 June 1970	VAH, Sheridan, Wyo.	Big Horn	do	6,975	32,783	S	Sheridan, Wyo.	6,000		6,000
71-D-0186, 25 Aug. 1970	Sierra AD, Calif.	U.S. Fuel	October 1970-September 1971	4,200	23,520	S	Hiawatha, Utah	4,500		4,000
71-D-0184, 27 Aug. 1970	Tooele AD, Utah	Carbon	do	8,600	47,300	U	Martin, Utah			
71-D-0186, 25 Aug. 1970	do	do	do	3,250	17,713	U	Hiawatha, Utah			
71-D-0191, 10 Sept. 1970	do	do	do	3,250	18,005	U	Martin, Utah			
Total Tooele requirement, 15,100 tons.								12,800		10,000
71-D-0190, 4 Sept. 1970	Navajo AD, Ariz.	Sundance	do	300	2,700	U	Gallup, N. Mex.	0		0
70-D-1506, 18 June 1970	Othello AFS, Wash	Plateau	July 1970-September 1971	900	4,986	U	Wattis, Utah			
71-D-1085, 26 Aug. 1970	do	Continental	October 1970-September 1971	600	3,990	U	Hiawatha, Utah			
Total Othello requirement, 1,500 tons.								800		800
71-D-0189, 11 Sept. 1970	Pueblo AD, Colo.	Corley	October 1970-September 1971	12,500	71,875	S	Florence, Colo.	14,500		14,000
70-D-1500, 11 June 1970	Clear AFS, Alaska	Usibelli	July 1970-June 1971	65,000	458,250	S	Suntrana, Alaska	78,800		78,800
70-D-1500, 11 June 1970	Eielson AFB, Alaska	do	do	145,000	1,022,250	S	do	145,000		145,000
70-D-1500, 11 June 1970	Fort Wainwright, Alaska	do	do	140,000	980,000	S	do			
70-D-1501, 11 June 1970	do	B. & R.	do	52,000	339,040	S	do			
Total Wainwright requirement, 192,000 tons.								200,000		200,000

## PROGRAM/REGION 8 (DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, MARYLAND, NEW JERSEY, NEW YORK, PENNSYLVANIA, VIRGINIA)

70-D-0185, 30 Apr. 1970	Benton AFS, Pa.	Glen Burn	July 1970-April 1971	2,400	32,400	U	Shamokin, Pa.	2,540		2,540
70-D-0183, 27 Mar. 1970	Fort Dix, N.J.	Slattery	do	1,100	17,028	U	Suedberg, Pa.	0		0
70-D-1498	Camp Drum, N.Y.	Blue	do	750	10,462	SU	Eynon, Pa. Ashley, Pa., Taylor, Pa., Eynon, Pa.			
70-D-0182, 26 Mar. 1970	do	Direno	do	11,500	21,000	U	Llewellyn, Pa.			
Total Camp Drum requirement, 3,000 tons.								500		0
70-D-0183, 27 Mar. 1970	Indiantown Gap Mil. Reservation, Pa.	Slattery	do	2,000	27,295	U	Suedberg, Pa.			
70-D-1508, 12 June 1970	do	Foreston	do	2,250	32,850	U	Good Springs, Pa.			
70-D-1502, 29 June 1970	do	Quaker	do	800	10,600	S	Tremont, Pa.			
Total Indiantown requirement, 5,050 tons.								7,050		4,000
70-D-1502, 29 June 1970	VAH, Lebanon, Pa.	do	do	6,500	84,500	S	Tremont, Pa., Lykens, Pa.	4,000		0
70-D-0183, 27 Mar. 1970	Letterkenny AD, Pa.	Slattery	do	300	4,050	U	Suedberg, Pa.	375		0
70-D-0185, 30 Apr. 1970	U.S. Penitentiary, Lewisburg, Pa.	Glen Burn	July 1970-April 1971	9,500	114,750	U	Shamokin, Pa.	0		0
70-D-0183, 27 Mar. 1970	Fort George G. Meade, Md.	Slattery	do	3,000	38,250	U	Suedberg, Pa.	8,000		4,000
70-D-0198, 15 May 1970	Navy S. & PC. Center, Mechanicsburg, Pa.	Foreston	do	13,000	191,750	U, S	Valleyview, Pa.			
70-D-0197, 22 May 1970	do	Slattery	do	1,000	12,750	S	Atlas, Pa.			
71-D-0206, 27 Oct. 1970	do	do	November 1970-February 1971	500	7,375	U, S	do			
71-D-0207, 26 Oct. 1970	do	Foreston	November 1970-January 1971	2,000	32,000	U, S	Valleyview, Pa.			
Total Navy ships parts control center requirement, 32,000 tons.								27,000		27,000
70-D-1497, 5 June 1970	Fort Monmouth, N.J.	Slattery	July 1970-April 1971	1,000	13,030	S	Atlas, Pa.	1,200		0
70-D-0198, 15 May 1970	New Cumberland AD, Pa.	Foreston	do	10,000	135,500	U, S	Valleyview, Pa.			
Total New Cumberland requirement, 20,000 tons.								23,500		23,000
70-D-0188, 14 Apr. 1970	GSA Depot, Scotia, N.Y.	Blue	do	625	8,406	U, S	Plymouth and Ashley, Pa.	0		0
Total GSA depot requirement, 1,250 tons.										
70-D-0188, 14 Apr. 1970	Tobyhanna AD, Pa.	do	do	3,875	48,981	U, S	Plymouth, Ashley, Taylor, and Eynon, Pa. Harleigh, Hazelton, Swoyerville, Morea, and Raven Run, Pa.			
71-D-1499, 10 June 1970	do	Lehigh Valley	do	2,400	30,120	S				

Contract number and date, DSA600-	Installation	Contractor	Contract term	Quantity (net tons)	Total cost for coal	Type of mine	Location of mine	Estimated (net tons)	
								1972	1973
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
70-D-0190, 1 Apr 1970	Tobyhanna AD, Pa	K. & D.	July 1970-April 1971	10,000	121,000	S	St. Nicholas, Pa.		
70-D-0189, 7 Apr. 1970	do	Lehigh Valley	do	5,450	68,758	S	Harleigh, Hazelton, Swoyerville, Raven Run, Pa.		
Total Tobyhanna requirement, 25,600 tons.								25,850	25,000
70-D-0183, 27 Mar. 1970	GSA Fuel Yard No. 1, Washington, D.C.	Slattery	do	1,900	26,822	U	Suedburg, Pa.	1,200	1,200
70-D-0188, 14 Apr. 1970	VAH, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	Blue	do	2,625	32,813	U, S.	Ashley, Pa.		
Total Wilkes-Barre requirement, 5,250 tons.								3,000	0

PROGRAM/REGION 9 (MONTANA AND NORTH DAKOTA)

70-D-0156, 29 Jan. 1970	Fortuna AFS, Mont.	Baukol-Noonna	July 1970-November 1971	4,000	10,560	S	Larson, N. Dak.	0	0
70-D-0154, 20 Feb. 1970	Minot AFB, N. Dak.	Consolidation	do	63,000	166,320	S	Voltaire, N. Dak.	45,000	45,000
70-D-0154, 20 Feb. 1970	USAF Reg. Hospital Minot, N. Dak.	do	do	6,000	15,840	S	do	4,400	4,400
70-D-0167, 27 Jan 1970	Bureau of Indian Affairs, New Town, N. Dak.	Dayi Alden	do	300	1,245	S	do	0	0

PROGRAM REGION 99 (STANDBY CONTRACTS FOR VARIOUS AIR FORCE BASES IN EASTERN UNITED STATES)

71-D-0213, 1 Dec. 1970	Various Air Force installations	Pittston	December 1970-November 1971	43,775	550,938	U, S <sup>1</sup>	Meriden, Clinchfield, Lorado, W.Va.		
------------------------	---------------------------------	----------	-----------------------------	--------	---------	-------------------	-------------------------------------	--	--

SUMMARY

Total number of contracts	129	Total quantity (net tons)	3,439,166
Total number of installations	159	Total surface mined (net tons) (33.9 percent)	1,165,605
Total value	\$32,085,472	Total underground (net tons) (66.1 percent)	2,273,561

<sup>1</sup> Contractor may ship from either a surface or underground mine at its option. For statistical purposes only, it is assumed here that deliveries will be made in equal parts from surface and underground mines.

GLOSSARY

- A: Auger mine.
- AAP: Army ammunition plant.
- AD: Army depot.
- AFB: Air Force base.
- AFS: Air Force station.
- AMP: Army missile plant.
- BKS: Barracks.
- DCSC: Defense construction supply center.
- DESC: Defense electronics supply center.
- FSS: Federal supply service.
- GSA: General Services Administration.
- MCB: Marine Corps base.
- NOS: Naval ordnance station.
- NTC: Naval training center.
- NWS: Naval weapons station.
- S: Surface mine.
- U: Underground mine.
- VAC: Veterans' Administration center.
- VAH: Veterans' Administration hospital.

LIST OF CURRENT SUPPLIERS

- Dayl Alden Coal Company, Newton, North Dakota.
- Alley-Cassetty Coal Company, 1040 Jo Johnston Avenue, Nashville, Tennessee.
- American Metals Climax, Inc. (Ayrshire Coal Company Division), 105 South Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Indiana.
- B & R Inc, Box 40, Healy, Alaska.
- Barbara Kay Coal, Inc., Box 397, Marion, Illinois.
- Baukol-Noonan, Inc., Noonan, North Dakota.
- Bell-Zoller Coal Company, 208 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois.
- Big Horn Coal Company, P.O. Box 724, Sheridan, Wyoming.
- Bills Coal Company, Inc., Welch, Oklahoma.
- Blue Coal Corporation, P.O. Box 568, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania.
- Blue Diamond Coal Company, P.O. Box 10080, Knoxville, Tennessee.
- Boone County Coal Corporation, 824 Fifth Avenue, Huntington, West Virginia.

- Bradford Coal Company, Inc., Bigler, Pennsylvania.
- Capitol Coal Sales Corporation, Suite 608, 1725 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.
- Carbon Fuel Company, PO Box 506, Helper, Utah.
- Columbus Coal Corporation, 380 Neilston Street, Columbus, Ohio.
- Consolidation Coal Company, PO Box 100, Minot, North Dakota.
- Consolidation Coal Company, Youngstown Municipal Airport, Ohio.
- Continental Coal Company, North 705, Washington Street, Spokane, Washington.
- The Corley Company, PO Box 1821, Colorado Springs, Colorado.
- Crown Coal-Coke Company, 415 Porter Building, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
- Direnzo Coal Company, PO Box 752, Pottsville, Pennsylvania.
- H. E. Drummond Coal Company, PO Box 1549, Jasper, Alabama.
- Eastern Associated Coal Corporation, 2425 Koppers Building, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
- Eigin Coal, Inc., PO Box 247, Whitwell, Tennessee.
- Farragut Anthracite Company, Lehigh & Poplar Streets, Mt. Carmel, Pennsylvania.
- Foreston Coal Sales Company, 353 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York.
- Franklin Coals Sales Company, 10 Office Park Circle, Birmingham, Alabama.
- Freeman Coal Mining Corporation, Division General Dynamics Corporation, 307 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.
- General Coal Company, 123 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Glen Burn Colliery, Inc., P.O. Box 101, Mt. Carmel, Pennsylvania.
- Great Lakes Coal-Dock Company, 2102 University Avenue, St. Paul, Minn.
- Hallmark & Reid Coal Company, Redstone Arsenal, Alabama.
- Hometown Incorporation, 1518 East North Avenue, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
- Imperial Coal Company, 1010 Western Federal Savings Building, Denver, Colorado.

- Inter-Mountain Coals, Inc., P.O. Box 480, 611 Bk. of Knoxville Bldg., Knoxville, Tennessee.
- Island Creek Coal Sales Company, 1501 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
- Ernest Johnson Fuel Transportation, Inc., 1211 Roosevelt Avenue, Indianapolis, Indiana.
- K & D Coal Company, P.O. Box 404, Chatham, New Jersey.
- The Kiesel Company, 1717 Park Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri.
- Kirkpatrick Coal Company, P.O. Box 17468, Memphis, Tennessee.
- Logan-Kanawha Coal Company, Inc., 3412 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.
- Mercer Coal & Supply Company, 447 Neilston Street, Columbus, Ohio.
- Midland Coal Company, 300 First National Bank Building, Rock Island, Illinois.
- Midvale Coal Company, Inc., Midvale, Ohio.
- Morris & Sons, DBA Pacific Coast Coal & Oil Company, 903 Arctic Building, Seattle, Washington.
- Mt. Pleasant Mining Company, 2208 Berne Avenue, Terre Haute, Indiana.
- N. & W. Sales Inc., P.O. Box 552, Worthington, Ohio.
- North American Coal Corporation, Utah Division, 1750 University Club Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Peabody Coal Company, 301 North Memorial Drive, St. Louis, Missouri.
- James Pickands-Company, 114 North Front Street, Marquette, Michigan.
- Pittsburgh-Midway Coal Manufacturing Company, Gulf Building, 1780 South Bellaire Street, Denver, Colorado.
- Pittston Coal Sales Corporation, Suite 1850, Two Pennsylvania Plaza, New York, New York.
- Plateau Mining, Ltd., P.O. Box 539, Price, Utah.
- Pocono Fuels Company, 528 North New Street, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.
- Quaker Products, Inc., One East Wynnewood Road, Wynnewood, Pennsylvania.

C. Reiss Coal Company, Reiss Building, P.O. Box 688, Sheboygan, Wisconsin.  
 Riddle Coal Company, 613 East Coffee Street, Manchester, Tennessee.  
 Scotie Coal Company, P.O. Box 10080, Knoxville, Tennessee.  
 Slattery Brothers, Inc., 110 Bala Avenue, Bala-Cynwyd, Pennsylvania.  
 Sundance Coal Company, P.O. Box 1402, Gallup, New Mexico.  
 United Electric Coal Companies, 307 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.  
 United States Fuel Company, 1919 University Club Building, 136 East South Temple Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.  
 Usibelli Coal Mine, Inc., Usibelli, Alaska.  
 Hooversville Supply Company 22 West Pennsylvania Avenue, Room No. 206, Baltimore, Maryland.

**LIST OF FEDERAL BUILDINGS USING COAL PURCHASED BY DFSC**

The Capitol Power Plant furnishes heating to the following:  
 Rayburn Office Bldg.  
 Longworth Office Bldg.  
 Cannon Office Bldg.  
 U.S. Capitol.  
 Old Senate Office Bldg.  
 New Senate Office Bldg.  
 Main Library of Congress.  
 Annex to Library of Congress.  
 Folger-Shakespeare Library.  
 City Post Office.  
 Government Printing Office.  
 Botanic Gardens.  
 Botanic Gardens Office Bldg.  
 The Central and West Heating Plants are interconnected. The following Federal buildings are heated by these plants:  
 Interior Dept.  
 Internal Revenue Bldg.  
 Justice Dept.  
 The New Justice Bldg.  
 ICC Labor Bldg.  
 Old Post Office Bldg.  
 Archives.  
 U.S. Court House.  
 Tariff.  
 Pension Bldg.  
 Federal Trade Commission, 101 Indiana Ave. (Homeowners Loan Assoc.) Liberty Loan.  
 Agricultural South Bldg. and Annex.  
 Agriculture Administration Bldg.  
 Veterans Adm.  
 Auditors Annex (1 & 2).  
 Lafayette.  
 FOB 10A (some FAA people).  
 Fed. Bldg. 5 (Forrestal Bldg.).  
 HEW North.  
 HEW South.  
 Fed. Bldg. 1 (FBI Bldg.).  
 GSA Regional Office.  
 HUD Bldg.  
 Fed. Bldg. 6.  
 Fed. Bldg. 10B.  
 Fed. Bldg. 8.  
 State Dept.  
 Commerce Dept.  
 Fed. Bldg. 9.  
 GSA Central Office.  
 Executive Office Bldg.  
 Court of Claims.  
 Fed. Bldg. 7.  
 Potomac Annex.  
 Museum of History and Technology.  
 Municipal Center.  
 National Gallery of Art.  
 District Bldg.  
 New D.C. Public Library.  
 D.C. Public Library.  
 Freer Art Gallery.  
 Smithsonian F St. Gallery.  
 Bureau of Engraving & Printing and Annex.  
 Treasury & Annex.  
 Federal Reserve Board.  
 DAR.  
 Pan American Union.  
 National Academy of Sciences.

**THE B-1 BOMBER**

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a former jet fighter pilot in the Korean war I am keenly interested in U.S. strategic air capabilities. I make it a point to keep abreast of achievements in air technology and equipment as they occur.

It is because of my keen interest that I have been following the development of the new manned bomber, the B-1. And it is because of my understanding of its development process and my insight into the technical aspects of the plane and its equipment that I am so disturbed by recently published reports that the B-1 is having cost and management problems. These reports are misleading and inaccurate and I want to set the record straight.

According to one article:

Government Auditors (GAO) have uncovered a \$1.3 billion cost overrun in the Air Force B-1 strategic bomber program. . . .

In fact, a \$1.3 net cost estimate increase did occur between the time that the Air Force developed a preliminary estimate of total program costs and the time that the request for proposal was received from the aircraft industry. This increase constituted a necessary and appropriate update of the preliminary program estimate and was documented in recurring reports to the Congress.

The increase was not uncovered by the GAO or any other agency. Likewise, the increase is not, as alleged, a cost overrun, it represented conscious Air Force effort in an evolutionary process to identify and price out all elements of cost applicable to the program.

These particular adjustments of the preliminary estimate included: First, an amount for economic escalation over the life of the development program and to update the production program to fiscal year 1970 dollar value; second, an amount attributed to the AMSA program, the forerunner of the B-1; and third, amounts for testing and support and SRAM interface not previously charged to the B-1 program.

So it can be seen that the \$1.3 figure I mentioned earlier is not an "overrun" as popularly understood. Rather, as was accurately pointed out by GAO, it represents the change in the Government estimate for the total B-1 programs as developed over the period from June 1969 to June 1970, and reported to Congress in the selected acquisition reports—SAR. In this connection I would stress that the program estimate shown in the June 1969 report was a preliminary Government estimate developed prior to the issuance of the Air Force's request for proposal for the private sector development contract. Thus as the source selection was completed and the contract figures became available, the estimates were revised and the new figures were incorporated in the June 1970 report.

The reported increase was largely caused by economic escalation, but there were some technical bookkeeping reasons for it as well. Between June 1969 and June 1970, the cost estimate increased

\$982 million solely as a result of translating costs of the development program and the procurement program to current dollar values. This represented sheer inflation. But just as important from a cost reporting view, the June 1969 SAR value was in constant fiscal year 1968 dollars in accordance with the then existing ground rules for SAR preparation. In contrast, the June 1970 value was a mixture of escalated dollars for development and constant fiscal year 1970 dollars for procurement. Inclusion of inflation factors was not routine and ground rules were not established to apply escalation factors uniformly in program reporting until the September SAR. The remainder of the \$1.3 billion increase included \$139 million of AMSA study funds not previously charged against the B-1 program, as well as another \$187 million for other Government costs such as test support, SRAM interface, and so forth, and some program adjustments and corrections.

Finally the value of \$10.1 billion reflected in the June 1970 SAR was the estimate for the total B-1 program to include the development contracts with North American Rockwell and General Electric, costs to develop the avionics, and a current best estimate for the costs of an eventual procurement program for which no contracts are anticipated until a year after the aircraft first flies in 1974.

Mr. Speaker, regarding a new program estimate, the Air Force has submitted revised estimates to Congress each quarter. By September 1970, these estimates reflected further anticipated increases in the program to \$11.4 billion. These anticipated program costs prompted the Air Force to undertake an intensive study of the entire program, including its management philosophy. As a result the entire development program has been revised and significant cost reductions and scheduled improvements have been realized.

In accordance with the outlines of the revised development the B-1 is being designed for considerable growth in avionics during the later years of its lifetime. This is being done in recognition of the fact that the defensive threat which the B-1 must cope with will increase in severity during the late 1980's. However, the avionics system that will be installed in the production B-1 aircraft is expected to be considerably less costly and will be specifically tailored to meet the threat anticipated for its early flying years. This initial production avionics system will take maximum advantage of existing technology and its development will be paced to insure that the first production B-1 to join the strategic air command force will have a fully operational avionics system sized and configured to perform its total offensive-defense avionics tasks.

Speaking of offensive-defensive tasks, contrary to the impression gained from newspaper accounts, the SRAM test program has been quite successful. Recent flight tests launched from both the B-52 and FB-111 have reinforced Air Force and OSD confidence that the SRAM will be a very effective missile. The operational flexibility of the B-1 is increased by the availability of the SRAM. But this is by no means the only weapon planned

for use by the B-1. Other weapons offer an extremely effective means of delivering large megatonnage against very large or very hard targets against which the lighter weight, low yield missile warheads are not nearly as useful.

Mr. Speaker, it has also been alleged that the B-1 program is being managed outside of existing directives prescribing DOD procedures for development programs. To the contrary, the B-1 program is the first program to come under the Laird-Packard approach to management, and focuses on getting full benefits for tax dollar expenditures.

The Air Force has implemented the Laird-Packard management practices on the B-1 program. The revised program of reducing the number of test aircraft and the elimination and reduction of many unsuccessful management practices that have hampered past programs is an example of the direct application of these practices.

I think the Air Force should be proud of its record on keeping the B-1 on schedule and within the authorized congressional fiscal levels. The fiscal baseline for the current program was established in the June 30, 1970 SAR to Congress and since that time the total cost of the development program has been reduced by over \$55 million from that fiscal baseline. In addition, the Air Force has kept the program on schedule.

It is important to note that a primary objective of this revision process was to reduce the national resource commitment for the B-1 program to the lowest possible level prior to reaching the planned production decision point of April 1975. Under this program revision process the total dollars committed at the time of first flight were reduced and the production decision authority will be given 1 full year of actual flight performance upon which to base a production decision. This is in accordance with the DOD "fly before buy" concept.

All in all, from its very inception the B-1 program has been extremely cost conscious. The Air Force and the Department of Defense have determined that the program must be run with a continuing high level emphasis on controlling costs. It has, however, been equally emphasized that the B-1 must be a useful and cost effective weapon system, a system that will continue to provide a credible strategic deterrent for the United States in the years ahead. In my judgment, the current B-1 program meets both these objectives.

Mr. Speaker, there is a greater awareness of domestic needs in this country today than ever before. This has led to heavy pressure on Federal efforts to meet these needs. At the same time there is a budget problem, for our resources are obviously not limitless.

It goes without saying that doing the things we are talking about in this country and achieving our national goals, are not "either/or" propositions. We must strive to accomplish as many as possible. But if we are not secure in our national defense, and other nations bring us to heel, all our programs and our hopes, however well intentioned, will go out the window. Conversely, if we have the best military posture in the world, and other

needed, high priority programs suffer at the expense of this, then we have lost in another way. Consequently, we must study as best we can the capabilities of potential enemies—not as a scare tactic, not to produce a panic reaction—but because the capabilities of potential enemies are, after all, the true measure of the forces we really need.

One has to say the Soviet ballistic missile force is increasing in numbers. Their submarine capability, with sea-launched missiles, is also increasing. In fact, in total land and sea-based missile payload, the Soviets have more than a two to one advantage over U.S. resources.

In aircraft, the Soviets have a new swing-wing bomber prototype, and they are turning out about one new fighter design each year. In the process they are not phasing out their current bomber force. As a consequence, while we retain a lead in heavy bombers, we do not in total heavy and medium bombers. In fact, our strategic bomber force has been cut drastically in recent years. We have phased out the entire B-58 force sooner than previously planned, and our purchases of the FB-111 have been sharply reduced.

In my judgment, and I know my thinking is shared by Air Force balance-of-forces experts, the national defense system of this Nation should be buttressed by an appropriate mixture of three strategic force elements; bombers, land-based missiles, and sea-based missiles.

As a result of simulated war gaming and other forms of systems analysis it has been demonstrated that to maintain an assured destruction capability, a combination of bombers and missiles has definite advantages over either an all-bomber or an all-missile force. This way, the enemy must program his resources to counter both missiles and aircraft. By dividing his efforts, he cannot concentrate on any one system. He is thus less likely to neutralize even one of our strategic force elements, let alone all three. Further, this complicates his defense problems considerably and requires commitment of far more resources.

On the basis of this strategic concept the question of what would be the effect of stripping manned bombers from our deterrent forces is answered. Obviously, we would have to put much greater reliance on missiles. In my view, we would have less flexibility and fewer options to consider in response to an enemy threat.

A few years ago, when intercontinental ballistic missiles were first becoming operational, it was then thought to be impossible to defend against them. But with systems like ABM, this has changed, actually enhancing rather than reducing the strategic role of manned aircraft.

There are other advantages of maintaining advanced aircraft in the defensive inventory. For instance, you can have a show of strength with bombers without threatening a cataclysmic confrontation, for manned aircraft can be controlled. They can be pulled back at the right time. You cannot say the same for missiles.

From another perspective, there are no crystal balls in the national defense busi-

ness; it is impossible to foretell all the various uses to which our strategic forces will be put. For example, no one foresaw the extensive use of the B-52 and the flying tanker in Southeast Asia. Tactical and strategic uses are open ended. The options often depend on the imagination directed toward a plane's use rather than on the particular limitations of the plane itself.

It is with the needs of the future in mind that the need for developing the B-1 becomes so compelling. Modernization of our forces is essential if we are to continue to possess a credible deterrent to the enemy. Planes do wear out. Their capabilities do become exhausted by new performance demands. The B-52 has been the backbone of our bomber system for more than a decade. But, the prototype B-52 was based on technology of the late 1940's, and first flew in 1952. The latest models were built in 1962.

Since the early days of World War II, American forces have never had to fight in the face of enemy air superiority. The Air Force is proud of that record. It has been a vital factor in dissuading would-be aggressors, and defeating those whose ambitions ran away with their judgment. I believe our pilots are the best in the world, but skill and determination can go only so far to compensate for inadequate equipment.

Eventually, technology changes so much that either potential new developments cannot be incorporated into old aircraft, or is it simply not economical to do so. Thus it makes sense to produce a modern aircraft that can handle the threat and will have growth potential for future developments.

The Air Force believes, and I agree, there are several specific factors that dictate against continuous modification of the present force of bombers. The latest model B-52—the "H" model—represents about the maximum growth attainable within the constraints of the basic design. Development of any new bomber aircraft requires about 8 years. By the time the Air Force could have a significant operational number of B-1's in the inventory, the B-52 will be 17 to 20 years old.

Also, if a major structure fatigue in the B-52 were detected, it could be too late to produce a timely replacement aircraft. The problem is compounded by large uncertainties in the magnitude of costs required to keep the old system viable. We have already invested \$2.5 billion in the B-52 update costs through fiscal 1969.

Finally, while the effectiveness of the B-52 can be upgraded by equipping the current force with the latest weapons and systems, it would be unduly expensive to make the plane faster, carry more payload, fly lower, or have a smaller radar cross-section.

Mr. Speaker, some people have asked me why cannot the FB-111 be used as a replacement for the B-52? The answer is that the FB-111 was developed from the F-111 design only as an interim aircraft to replace the B-52C through F models as they neared the end of their operational life expectancy. As a strategic bomber, the FB-111 design has definite limitations—it has limited payload

capacity, limited avionics capabilities, limited range, and it requires greater tanker support than does the B-52 or the B-1.

I have also been asked what is to keep the B-1 from becoming obsolete even before it can be ready for active duty. The answer to this is that the B-1 is being designed to take advantage of the many technical advances growing out of the past decade. Compared to the B-52, the B-1 will have a higher penetration speed, a reduced radar cross-section, a larger payload capacity, a better capability to penetrate at lower altitudes, a quicker reaction launch, and the characteristics necessary to operate from austere dispersal bases. The B-1 also possesses better electronic countermeasures, target-finding systems, and weapon delivery systems. Taken together this equipment will further improve the ability of the B-1 to deal with enemy targets in both nuclear and non-nuclear wars and confrontations.

Finally, the B-1 will not become obsolete before full operational readiness because there is a built-in growth factor, whereby allowances are made for incorporating further advances as they are developed.

Over the past 5 years, technical risks have been reduced through an extensive advanced development program. This provides additional assurance that the full-scale development program, though methodical, will not be excessively drawn out. The attainment of the date for the initial operational capability—IOC—with the B-1 is not the primary driving factor in this program. However, based on present and anticipated funding and an orderly progression of development, defense planners now expect the B-1 to be operational in 1978.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn for a moment to another factor which improves the bomber component of our strategic forces; namely, increasing the effectiveness of manned bombers as an instrument of control in limited conflict. On the basis of my experience, I believe that much of the misunderstanding on this point is caused by one prevalent but erroneous view of aerospace power, particularly military aerospace power, and this view is reinforced by movies and novels on the subject.

It is commonly held that the usefulness of military aerospace power is confined almost solely to preventing or deterring nuclear war. Yet those who hold this view have not apparently digested yet one of the more important points that President Nixon emphasized in his foreign policy report to the Congress:

The overriding purpose of our strategic posture is political and defensive: to deny other countries the ability to impose their will on the United States and its allies under the weight of strategic military superiority. We must insure that all potential aggressors see unacceptable risks in contemplating a nuclear attack, or nuclear blackmail, or acts which could escalate to strategic nuclear war, such as a Soviet conventional attack on Europe.

To fulfill this broader purpose of our strategic forces, Mr. Speaker; that is, to control limited conflict, we need a capability for selective retaliation against

such an attack. Bombers are not the only weapons that could perform this task, but they are clearly the best suited for it. Missiles once launched are committed, and they impose on the opponent a heavy demand for quick reaction. This, in turn, invites uncontrolled escalation. By contrast, bombers can be prepositioned in close proximity to the target or placed on airborne alert, thus providing more time for the opponent to consider his response and react in a deliberate, carefully controlled manner.

The factors I have just detailed will assume a much greater importance after Communist China has acquired an ICBM force of significant size. Our strategic forces will then have to be prepared for retaliation against both China and the Soviet. Or then again they might be called upon to retaliate only against China. In this latter case, bombers could be used repeatedly against China and still be a part of the deterrent to the Soviet.

I would also point out that our need for bombers is much more urgent today than it was 5 years ago when we had a wide margin of strategic superiority—with or without bombers—over the Soviet Union and when China did not have a nuclear capability. Today, with a policy of strategic sufficiency, we need forces that incorporate the versatility of manned bombers. Only with forces such as these can we operate from a position of near parity to achieve the two major objectives that I mentioned earlier; to deter full-scale nuclear conflict, and to deter or control limited conflict.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this short review of the need for the B-1 bomber coupled with my review of its programmatic soundness from a fiscal and a functional point of view will demonstrate to our colleagues that the B-1 is a needed plane and a good buy for the money.

I cannot overstate the importance of continuing the development and testing of this aircraft. From its very inception, it has been the most important corner this nation has turned since the decision was made to develop the ICBM on a priority basis. And inasmuch as we are still facing the threat of nuclear holocaust and since we still face an implacable enemy in communism, the B-1 program must continue at full speed.

#### DRUG ADDICTION IN THE MILITARY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address myself to a crisis facing our country which calls for sweeping new legislation to completely overhaul the armed services' policy in handling the problem of drug addiction.

I contemplate introducing legislation next week which would make identification and rehabilitation of GI drug addicts mandatory on the part of the military.

The key feature of my proposed legislation is a provision that those addicts who are detected through mandatory repeated testing processes would be re-

quired to go through the rehabilitation program on their own time and not on the military's. In other words the period of time the GI's cure takes would not be included within his military commitment and his length of service would be deferred and have to be fulfilled through a comparable extension beyond his original discharge date.

This, I believe, will overcome the legal question of extended military service beyond the obligated period. Further, the requirement to defer discharges would serve as an effective deterrent to the taking of drugs. Also, I feel it will stop many GI's who take the drug route as a means of being discharged from the service before their time is up. This has resulted in countless addicts being turned loose with uncontrollable habits, posing terrifying threats to themselves and to all society.

The bill, which would create a Narcotics Control Force in each branch of the armed services, would also provide after-discharge programs for those ex-GI's who became addicted prior to the proposed new policy and for those servicemen who may be released as cured under the proposed program but who may later go back to the use of drugs. These facilities would be provided through newly created treatment and rehabilitation centers in the Public Health Service and through widely expanded Veterans' Administration programs.

Drug addiction has become a greater hazard for our military men than the risk of being shot. I was in Vietnam from April 11 through April 14 and had the opportunity to make an on-the-spot study of the narcotics crisis in the Armed Forces there.

I believe a reliable estimate of 60,000 GI's using hard drugs is a fair appraisal. And most of these men will not be detected or treated before being discharged and returned to their communities. It is only fair to the GI's themselves and to society that these men be identified and treated before they leave the armed services.

If a GI had typhoid or malaria, the military would not send him home just because he is due for discharge. Well, narcotics addiction is contagious and it has become epidemic. It is time for laws to be changed to recognize this tragic reality.

Marihuana seems no longer to be the popular thing in most units in the Armed Forces. It has been to easily detectable, through its odor when smoked, or by trained dogs who have been brought into barracks to sniff it out from its hiding places.

The big scene now is the smoking of heroin sprinkled in ordinary cigarettes. The stuff is so pure that the smoker gets a full high merely by inhaling. What he does not realize is that it is just as addictive this way as it is through taking it by needle into the veins.

That occasional "Saturday night high" soon develops into a dependency and one by one the GI's are becoming hooked. And what is so terrifying about this is that the \$5 to \$6 a day habit in Vietnam could well become a \$100- to \$200-a-day

habit back home. This is because the heroin, known as "scag" there, costs only a trifle compared to the prices here and the stuff obtained there is as pure as heroin can be. The dilution of the heroin here reduces its potency about 15 times. Hence, the effect realized by smoking the stuff he gets when he returns home will be nil. It is too diluted to have much effect. The only way his habit can be fed here is through vein injections.

While in Vietnam I was able to buy heroin easily. In an area known as "Scag Alley", just a few blocks from Tansonnhut Airport, I was able to purchase two vials of pure, unadulterated heroin, each containing 250 milligrams for less than \$4. A chemical analysis of the heroin I bought, made by the Bureau of Narcotics reveals it is 95 percent pure—as pure as heroin can be. Roaming other areas of Saigon, I "scored" in at least eight other instances with pushers ranging in age from about 8 to 14 years of age.

At Longbinh, the Army's largest base in Vietnam, I wore Army fatigues, rode in the van of a truck in an Army convoy on roads immediately surrounding the base, and found 11 "stalls" where scag was being sold openly. Teenage pushers would sidle up on scooters to the van of our truck to ply their wares.

I made these purchases, Mr. Speaker, to illustrate how easily available, how cheap, and how pure heroin is in Vietnam. That is why addiction is spreading into epidemic proportions in Vietnam.

Many of the GI's are doing it for kicks; some because they are bored. Others because it is the thing to do, and in many cases, they do not like the idea of being there in the first place and this is their escape.

Whatever the reason, the blatant realism is that 20 to 30 percent of the GI's in Vietnam are using the hard stuff in some form or another. And in some units, like Longbinh, usage has reached an estimate of 50 percent among the GI's in the E-5 category and under.

Vietnam is literally saturated with dope. And until now the Vietnamese Government has done little if anything to crack down on its flow.

In my 2-hour meeting with Vice President Ky, while in Saigon, I confronted the Vice President with the obvious laxity of the Vietnamese Government in dealing with the drug problem citing my own experiences on how easily he was able to get pure heroin right out in the open. Ky admitted that until recently his country considered drugs an American problem but they can do this no longer for it has become imbedded into their own culture. He assured a new, tough policy.

The drug scene is not peculiar only to Vietnam. Reports indicate its heavy prevalence with units in Germany and with our troops in other parts of the world and, of particular significance, with our military bases right here in the United States.

I also recently visited Fort Bragg, N.C., where the military's first and most advanced drug rehabilitation facility is located. A recent survey at Fort Bragg showed that 64 percent of the GI's have experimented in drugs in some form or another. Of this amount, admittedly, 17 percent have been involved in the use of hard drugs.

As commendable as the Bragg rehabilitation experiment is, it still falls far short of getting the support it should have from the Pentagon. Much of the funds needed to support the program are contributed by officers and their wives and families. This is the military's obligation and a vitally needed program such as this should not have to depend on charity.

The travesty of the military's policy is that the men who are addicted are released before they are amply treated or cured. In most cases, when a GI is addicted, he is given physical withdrawal treatments and then discharged. This results in their return to society before they are ready and they are faced with the inevitable regression back to drugs.

Under my bill, the military would be required to begin testing each GI at various periods beginning 6 months before his discharge in order to ascertain drug use. Once identification is established, the youth would be subject to treatment and rehabilitation. The period of time the GI's cure takes would not be included within his military commitment and his length of service would be deferred and have to be fulfilled through a comparable extension beyond his original discharge date.

The bill goes further by providing after-discharge programs for those addicted ex-GI's who have already been discharged and under present policy do not qualify for Government help for cures. In many instances, these veterans received the kind of discharge that would disqualify them from veterans facilities, which, at best, are still far from adequate in dealing with the drug problem.

Also, even under my proposal, there is no way of assuring that the GI who goes through the cure process and then is released will permanently stay off drugs. There must be Public Health Service treatment and rehabilitation facilities for him to go as well as a broad and modernized Veterans' Administration program to deal with the problem. My legislation will provide for such programs and for their required manpower and resources.

#### CANNIKIN NUCLEAR TEST: WHY IT MUST BE DONE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a campaign is being mounted by various groups and individuals to force postponement if not abandonment of the planned Cannikin nuclear detonation now scheduled for Amchitka Island in October. Various specious reasons are being advanced as to why this test should not take place.

A stream of adverse consequences are being postulated—alleged ecological damage, alleged earthquake and tsunami generation, and alleged possible interference with international disarmament negotiations. One less obvious hypothesis is the idea that if cancellation of Cannikin can somehow be pressured, that could lead to an easement—or perhaps appeasement—in our negotiations with the Soviet Union and the remote possi-

bility of concluding a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty.

Let me discuss this last item first.

#### WHY WE MUST TEST

In the April 11 issue of the Washington Post, there was an article headlined "Tiniest 'A' Blast Identifiable Now." This article erroneously claimed that the United States can now detect and identify even a one kiloton underground nuclear explosion. Our colleague, Mr. HOLIFIELD, a former chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and a member of that committee since its inception 25 years ago, was mystified by this article. In listening to testimony from experts for the past 15 years, he had never heard about identifying seismic events which could correspond to as little as one kiloton in any form of underground medium. Neither had I nor any other member of the Joint Committee ever heard of such a thing.

Mr. HOLIFIELD therefore prepared and released comments which pointed out that this "new information," supposedly based on leaked results from a scientific meeting of seismologists held at Woods Hole, Mass., in July 1970, was completely erroneous. I have received unanimous consent for Mr. HOLIFIELD's comments to appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the end of my statement.

I suppose one could ask, as has been asked for many years, Why does the United States continue to test? The answer is very simply—it is an unfortunate necessity to assure our national security. I know that I speak for the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy as well as a majority of both Houses of Congress and the people of the United States when I say I wish nuclear weapons testing were not necessary. But it is necessary, and idealistic daydreams will not alter that fact. The Soviet Union is engaged in a massive buildup of its offensive missile force. This cannot be ignored or wished away. To believe that unilateral disarmament on our part or cancellation of the Cannikin test will suddenly and miraculously result in reciprocal Soviet initiatives is engaging in serious self-delusion.

The President's announcement today of progress in the SALT negotiations belies the assertions of those who would claim that the detonation of the Cannikin event at "no more than 5 megatons" would be detrimental and deleterious to our international negotiations evidently do not keep up with current events. On October 14, 1970, the Soviet Union conducted a nuclear experiment on Novaya Zemlya Island which was reported in the 3 to 6 megaton range. While there were no reported damaging effects from this detonation, there were also no reported criticisms from U.S. citizens or those anywhere in the world who would claim that this test would or should affect Soviet Union international negotiations.

Under the basic concept of maintaining the common defense and security of the United States, the President has authorized a series of underground nuclear tests and experiments. Cannikin is one of those tests. I hasten to point out that the United States is willing to discuss any aspect of disarmament. We are

now negotiating at Geneva and in the Vienna SALT talks, but we must not forfeit our bargaining strength.

#### ENVIRONMENT IS BEING PROTECTED

Let us consider the question of possible ecological damage to Amchitka Island. The Atomic Energy Commission has cooperated with the Department of Defense, the Interior Department, and the State of Alaska in conducting bio-environmental studies since the initial concept of the Milrow test, about 1967. The AEC was concerned with ecology long before it became a household word. AEC studies at Amchitka and in the surrounding area on seismology, hydrology, geology, bird lore, sea otter survival and possible radioactive contamination continue to this day.

I would like to point out that if it had not been for the efforts of the AEC, the sea otter population—which was being protected by a blanket "no hunting" rule—would have by this time been decimated by overpopulation and starvation. The AEC proposed and carried out an outstanding program to assure survival of these friendly sea beasts by having them moved to other coastal areas throughout Alaska, Canada, and the northwestern part of the United States. Certainly such humaneness deserves praise and not censure.

#### EARTHQUAKE AND TSUNAMI STUDIES

The question of the generation of significantly large secondary earthquakes and the possibility of the creation of tsunamis—sea waves—were examined publicly and at great length in this country in the summer and fall of 1969. This was in anticipation of the Milrow event of approximately one megaton which was conducted in October 1969 at Amchitka.

It is known by all who make even a superficial examination that the entire Aleutian chain is one of the most seismically active areas in the entire world. Since 1899 at least four earthquakes equal to or greater than magnitude 8 on the Richter scale have been recorded in the Aleutians, while there have been dozens with magnitudes between 7 and 8. I would like to submit for the RECORD at the end of my statement a table indicating earthquakes of magnitude 7 or greater in the Aleutians from 1899 to date. The original data were prepared by the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey with updated data supplied to me by the National Oceanographic Administration.

The table discloses an interesting phenomenon.

From 1899 on, there has not been any tsunami generation by any earthquake which occurred near or west of the 180° meridian, which includes Amchitka.

Returning to the Milrow test of 1969, which had an equivalent earthquake magnitude of 6.5 on the Richter scale, there was very little damage on the island itself, none to the surrounding area and the only water effect was a ripple a few inches high.

It has been stated in an AEC press release that Cannikin will not be larger than 5 megatons so at most, using established scaling laws in predicting the effects of Cannikin, we can anticipate a projected equivalent earthquake magnitude of 7.0 on the Richter scale. As a

result, it is highly improbable that a significant secondary earthquake would be generated. This is based upon data acquired from the Milrow test, which triggered no secondary shock, and from mainland U.S. tests where no secondary shock has ever been generated which was stronger than one-one hundredth of the original shock.

But what of the unlikely event that Cannikin does, in fact, result in an aftershock? The fact is that the maximum aftershock which could be postulated under this circumstance is a magnitude 5 earthquake which is accepted as an almost daily, or at least common, occurrence in the Aleutians where Amchitka is located.

With the predicted magnitude 7.0 on the Richter scale, for an event in the Aleutians which takes place west of the 180° meridian, the experts predict that no tsunami will be generated. As a matter of fact, on Sunday morning, May 2, 1971, an earthquake of magnitude 7.1 was recorded in the Aleutians at the Adak Island Naval Air Station. The epicenter of this seismic event was about 90 miles south of Adak and about 200 miles east of Amchitka. Here again we have a large earthquake causing essentially no ground motion damage and nothing more than the generation of a few ripples in the northern Pacific Ocean. Certainly, nothing that would be called a tsunami was noted.

#### NO RADIOACTIVITY RELEASES

In touching just briefly on the question of the escape of radioactivity, I should point out that none has been recorded from the Milrow event since 1969. In early 1966, after the long shot test of October 1965, some tritium was found in small lakes close to ground zero. This phenomenon has never been completely explained. However, none has been found offshore from Amchitka Island that can be construed as being above natural background levels. Monitoring for radioactivity is being continued and will continue for several years after the Cannikin event.

The AEC has prepared a second draft Cannikin environmental statement which reflects the comments of those agencies which responded to the original draft of June 1970.

At the invitation of the Governor and so that the people of Alaska may be fully informed as to the Cannikin test and possible effects, personnel from the AEC plan to make presentations and hold public meetings with Alaska citizens in all major cities and in those other places in Alaska where they receive requests for a public meeting.

Commissioner Clarence Larson was in Alaska earlier this week for a first-hand look at Amchitka Island and then went to Nevada to the test site to meet with visiting Alaskan legislators to kick-off the series of talks which explain the Cannikin program.

Mr. Speaker, I would conclude by stating that the detonation of the Cannikin event is in the best national interest of U.S. security. Until such time as there is an international agreement on the limiting or reduction of nuclear armament in the world, the United States cannot

and must not depend upon unilateral weapons reductions or cessation of testing. Wishful thinking will not make the world a better or a safer place in which to live.

I am also including in the RECORD at this point two additional documents which bear on this matter. One is a fine paper by Dr. William G. Van Dorn of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, discussing the possibility of tsunami generation by the Cannikin test, and the other is a letter from Russell E. Train, chairman of the President's Council on Environmental Quality, discussing AEC's compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act.

#### COMMENTS BY CONGRESSMAN CHET HOLIFIELD, JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY ON WASHINGTON POST NEWS ARTICLE OF APRIL 11, "TINIEST 'A' BLAST IDENTIFIABLE NOW"

I was considerably disturbed when I read the article "Tiniest 'A' Blast Identifiable Now" in the April 11 *Washington Post*. This article seems to be another in a series of statements attributable to the *Washington Post* which might be entitled, "wishing will make it so."

In February 1971 the Canadians at the Geneva disarmament conference proposed a threshold nuclear test ban treaty which would outlaw all explosions which had a seismic magnitude above a certain level. Mr. Ignatieff, the Canadian representative, conceded that an "across the board" prohibition in underground testing remains blocked by the long standing deadlock of on-site inspection at nuclear testing grounds. The Canadian position was based on a document prepared by Canadian scientists which indicated that detection thresholds are magnitude 4.2 by waves passing through the earth for explosions and earthquakes in Europe and North America, deteriorating to a detection threshold of magnitude 4.5 for Asian coverage, and deteriorating further to magnitude 5.0 in parts of the southern hemisphere. The threshold for detection—note that this is still detection not identification—is magnitude 4.8 for surface waves going through the earth's crust from earthquakes in North America and Europe, deteriorating to magnitude 5.1 for Asian coverage. Detection threshold is defined as the probability that 90 percent of a given number of stations worldwide will be to detect a given seismic event. According to the Canadians, the most generally applicable identification threshold is about magnitude 5.8 to magnitude 6.0 in much of the Northern Hemisphere.

I have made this long quote to show the latest information that the Canadians felt they had available as of November 1970, several months after the Woods Hole meeting.

The British, in December, 1965, published a very fine two volume document, "The Detection and Recognition of Underground Explosions," which was issued by their Atomic Weapons Research Establishment. The association of magnitudes with nuclear explosions in various subsurface media is very clearly presented on page 39, in figure 13, of Volume 1. The graph demonstrates very clearly that a 10 kiloton explosion would be equivalent to magnitude 4.5 in granite, that it would take a 20 kiloton explosion in tuff for magnitude 4.5, and 100 kilotons in alluvium; and I should point out that this alluvium need only be a few thousand feet deep, not tens of miles, to be detectable as magnitude 4.5.

The article of April 11 mentions the large seismic arrays which have been developed by the United States. I would like to quote from Summary of the 31 December 1970 report issued by Lincoln Laboratories of MIT on the Large Aperture Seismic Array (LASA) in Montana. This is the Fourteenth Semiannual Summary of the Seismic Discrimination Group of the Lincoln Laboratory:

"In order to establish the technical basis for any proposed arms control agreement banning underground nuclear explosions, we are pursuing research connected with the nature of explosions and earthquakes, the propagation path from source to receiver and methods of data analysis at the receiver."

So we see that the LASA has been in business for seven years and is still pursuing knowledge concerning discrimination between underground nuclear explosions and seismic events. It is obvious from the Washington Post April 11 article that the authors do not have the vaguest idea of the difference between detection and identification. It is unfortunate that some persons leaked an in-house document which has not been intended for publication, which was an internal working document, and which was essentially the product of a group of seismologists who were brainstorming on what might be possible in the future.

I would like to make two points: the need for on-site inspection continues as strongly as ever, should there be a push soon for a comprehensive test ban. Also, many seismic

events remain unidentified as natural phenomena, and a comprehensive test ban with present technology, without on-site inspection, would not be worth the paper on which it was written.

If, as the Canadians stated in their paper of November 1970, we can only identify events of magnitude 5.5 or 6, this could mean explosions up to one megaton in alluvium could be detected, but not identified.

The United States has just completed large seismic arrays in Alaska and Norway which are just beginning to produce data that eventually should be useful in aiding identification as well as the detection of seismic events.

I have been a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for 25 years—since its inception. Since the first time test ban treaties were proposed in the 1950's, the Committee has made every attempt to keep currently and fully informed of all progress made in the test detection field. We have annual briefings by the Department of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The Committee would be among the first to know if any breakthrough had actually been made whereby a comprehensive test ban would be acceptable without on-site inspection. This is not the case yet.

As you know, I have actively supported the SALT conferences and all phases of our steps to stop nuclear testing based on the status of our capability to detect and identify.

I cannot in good conscience gamble with our national security by relying on "wishful thinking" instead of hard scientific facts.

I recognize the difficulty a lay reporter has in writing articles on complicated technological and scientific programs as contradictory to basing an article on hypothetical projections of future scientific goals.

The least that a responsible reporter can do is to check the facts with informed Committee members or staff in order to obtain a balanced story. I refer to the Joint Committee members or their staff or responsible government scientists who are actively in charge of the specific program being reported upon.

EARTHQUAKES IN THE ALEUTIANS<sup>1</sup> 1899-1971

[M<sub>s</sub> ≥ 7.0; Longitudes between 163W and 170E]

Date (GMT)	Latitude N	Longitude W <sup>2</sup>	Depth	M <sub>s</sub> <sup>3</sup>	Tsunami magnitude <sup>4</sup>	Date (GMT)	Latitude N	Longitude W <sup>2</sup>	Depth	M <sub>s</sub> <sup>3</sup>	Tsunami magnitude <sup>4</sup>
Jan. 12, 1901	52.0	177.0	25	7.8	-----	Sept. 9, 1942	53.0	165.5	80	7.0	-----
Jan. 1, 1902	55.0	165.0	25	7.8	-----	July 27, 1944	54.0	165.5	70	7.1	-----
Feb. 14, 1905	53.0	178.0	S	7.75, 8.3	-----	Dec. 12, 1944	51.5	179.5E	S	7.0	-----
Aug. 7, 1906	51.0	179.0E	S	8.0, 8.3	-----	Apr. 1, 1946	52.75	163.5	S	7.4	5.0
Sept. 2, 1907	52.0	173.0E	S	7.75	-----	Nov. 1, 1946	51.5	174.5	40	7.0	-----
Sept. 8, 1909	52.5	169.0	90	7.4	-----	Feb. 2, 1949	53.0	173.0	220	7.0	-----
Sept. 9, 1910	51.5	176.0	S	7.1	-----	Jan. 5, 1953	53.0	171.5E	-----	7.1	-----
Jan. 4, 1912	52.0	179.0	S	7.0	-----	Jan. 2, 1957	53.0	168.0	-----	7.0	-----
Apr. 18, 1916	53.25	170.0	170	7.5	-----	Mar. 9, 1957	51.3	175.8	-----	8.3	3.5
Oct. 13, 1926	52.0	176.0	S	7.1	-----	Mar. 9, 1957	52.3	169.0	-----	7.1	-----
Mar. 7, 1929	51.0	170.0	50	8.1	0	Mar. 12, 1957	51.39	176.9	-----	7.3	-----
July 5, 1929	51.0	178.0	S	7.0	-----	Mar. 14, 1957	51.32	176.44	-----	7.5	-----
July 7, 1929	52.0	178.0	S	7.3	-----	Mar. 22, 1957	53.74	165.66	20	7.0	-----
Dec. 17, 1929	52.5	171.5E	S	7.6	-----	Apr. 19, 1957	52.0	166.5	-----	7.3	-----
Sept. 3, 1937	52.5	177.5	80	7.3	-----	Nov. 13, 1960	51.4	168.8	32	7.0	-----
Feb. 7, 1940	52.0	175.0E	70	7.0	-----	Feb. 4, 1965	51.3	178.6E	40	7.75	5
Apr. 16, 1940	52.0	173.5E	S	7.1	-----	Mar. 30, 1965	50.6	177.9E	51	7.3	-1
Apr. 16, 1940	52.0	173.5E	S	7.2	-----	Aug. 7, 1966	50.6	171.3	39	7.0	-----
July 14, 1940	51.75	177.5E	80	7.75	-----	May 14, 1969	51.3	179.9	21	7.0	-----
Aug. 22, 1940	53.0	165.5	S	7.1	-----	May 2, 1971	51.0	176.5	33	7.1	-----

<sup>1</sup> Prepared by U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey.

<sup>2</sup> W Long except where marked E.

<sup>3</sup> Magnitude determinations.

<sup>4</sup> Tsunami magnitude = Log to base 2 of maximum observed runup in meters. If no entry no runup reported anywhere.

<sup>5</sup> Pasadena.

\* Richter.

† Berkeley.

‡ National Oceanographic Agency.

Sources: 1899-1964, ref. 38 and supplemental CGS tabulations 1965—, misc.

PROBABILITY OF TSUNAMI GENERATION IN CONNECTION WITH CANNIKIN

(By Dr. William G. Van Dorn, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego)

Gentlemen: A good fraction of my scientific career has been concerned with tsunamis—both natural and man-made. I was responsible for measuring and evaluating the hazard from water wave effects for nearly all of the Pacific nuclear tests, and for many subsequent related studies. My investigation of natural tsunamis have led to a number of recommendations for improving public safety, only a few of which have been adopted.

I would like to emphasize here that I am as deeply concerned with the safety aspects of underground testing at Amchitka as anyone.

However, there are certain mitigating circumstances not mentioned in this memorandum which suggest that the risk of a destructive tsunami being generated in association with the proposed Cannikin test is not as great as implied. These circumstances have emerged fairly recently, as a result of studies initiated by the AEC, acting on recommendations of the Panel of Consultants, of which I am a member.

In order to properly qualify them, I would like to give you a perspective of what tsunamis are like, what factors combine to produce a destructive tsunami, and to what extent the probability that such a combina-

tion might occur in conjunction with Cannikin can reasonably be assessed.

A tsunami can be defined as any localized, impulsive deformation of the free ocean surface, whether produced by a volcanic or artificial explosion, a submarine landslide, or (most commonly) a sea floor dislocation accompanying an earthquake. Tsunamis come in all sizes, limited only by water depth and available energy, but we are concerned here only with potentially dangerous events.

However generated, the initial disturbance propagates radially away from its source region as a system of free gravity waves. A good example of a miniature tsunami is the familiar pattern of concentric rings of waves produced by dropping a pebble into a pond: the waves are highest and shortest near the source, and become lower and longer as they travel outward, somewhat like the extension of an accordion bellows. Upon entering shallow water near shore, this process is reversed; the waves grow higher and shorter again until they eventually run up against the shoreline and are partially reflected—or scattered—back out to sea.

Most of the damage from destructive tsunamis occurs during the first 5 or 6 hours after the first waves reach shore, although diminishing activity ensues for several days. The severity of local wave effects at a remote place depends in a complicated way upon several factors: the height and shape of the initial deformation, the distance the waves have traveled, and the local coastal

typography. Irrespective of other factors, there is a relatively sharp distinction between damage and no damage, depending upon whether or not local runup heights exceed the normal wave and tide range.

Owing to their complexity, most of these effects were long thought not to be realistically calculable on a deterministic basis. Within the past several years, however, significant advances have been made. First, extensive, post-event geophysical surveys after the great earthquake of March 28, 1964, in Alaska, have for the first time permitted a fairly complete picture of the source characteristics of a large tsunami. Second, comparative seismological, tectonic, and/or hydrodynamic data from Alaska, and the tsunamis of 1946 and 1957 (Aleutians), and 1960 (Chile) suggest that large tsunamis originating along the Pacific trench system have common generic features. Third, AEC and DOD-sponsored studies have resulted in the development of hydrodynamic computer codes for the deterministic calculation of wave systems produced by known sources, their propagation across the ocean, and the local wave response at remote points.

These codes are necessarily complex, fairly expensive to run, and are still incomplete; but present results include a convincing reconstruction of the generation of the Alaskan tsunami. Although the calculations covered an area only ten times that of the source, simplified geometric extrapolations to greater distances give wave heights that

agree with observations at small islands within a factor of two. The calculations are now being extended to arbitrary distances on a spherical ocean, and the local response factors will be computed at one or two more complex locations where comparative wave observations are available. These studies should be completed within three or four months.

As a result of these and previous studies, the present status of tsunami phenomenology might be summarized as follows.

1. Tsunamis seem principally to originate from elongate sources that parallel the trench systems ringing the Pacific Basin. These trenches are considered to be zones of crustal plate abutment, whose relative motions accumulate strain that is discontinuously released in the form of earthquakes. These zones are also characterized by volcanic activity and a long geologic history of large-scale accumulative dislocations. Only zones of vertical dislocation appear to be productive of tsunamis.

2. Historically, an average of 100 detectible tsunamis per century has occurred in the Pacific Basin, of which roughly 10 percent might be classes as widely destructive. Of the latter, eight have occurred since 1900, and five since 1945. According to recent statistics, a rough classification relating tsunamis to Richter earthquake magnitude is:

Richter  $M < 6.0$ , non-detectible  
 $6.0 < M < 6.5$ , barely detectible  
 $6.5 < M < 7.5$ , moderate  
 $M > 7.5$ , severe\*

In all the above classes, the majority of earthquakes in tsunamigenic regions have not produced tsunamis.

3. The Alaskan earthquake involved a vertical seafloor lift of from 6-30 ft. over 40,000 square miles; the potential energy of the deformed water surface was 1-3 megatons, or roughly an equal percentage of the strain energy released during the parent quake. Fragmentary uplift data from Chile, and the above-cited similarities in aftershock patterns and tide-gage records, suggest that the 1946, 1957, and 1960 tsunamis involved similar volumetric displacements.

4. Two geometrical effects govern the radial flux of wave energy. Elongate sources are somewhat directional. For Alaska, the aspect ratio (length:breadth) was about 4:1, and, although the wave pattern reconstruction was almost circular in midocean, the wave heights were twice as high normal to the longer axis of the source than parallel to it. Secondly, the radial attenuation of wave height with distance is the product of two factors: radial stretching and lateral spreading. The former persists at all distances, but the latter reaches a minimum at one-quarter of the earth's circumference and again increases; their product has a minimum at about 8000 miles. Thus, wave heights actually increase at greater distances, which accounts, in part, for the severity of damage in Japan from Chilean tsunamis, and conversely.

With respect to the probability of tsunami generation in association with the proposed Cannikin test, the following statements apply:

#### 1. DIRECT EFFECTS

During the Milrow test, surface doming due to cavity expansion produced a maximum of 8 inches of uplift along less than a mile of shoreline, and no measurable offshore fault displacements were observed. No anomalous waves were recorded by an array of bottom-mounted sensors within 5-15 miles of the shot point, and having a threshold resolution of about 1cm. Thus the maximum volumetric

sea surface displacement during this event was substantially less than one-millionth of that accredited to large tsunamis. No significant alteration of these circumstances is implied by the Cannikin test, or any nominal extrapolation thereof.

#### 2. INDIRECT EFFECTS

Principal public and scientific attention has been directed toward the possibility that a Cannikin-triggered earthquake might generate a destructive tsunami. This would require the coincidence of two apparently unprecedented events: the triggering of an earthquake along the Amchitka fault block west of Amchitka Pass having a Richter magnitude of at least 7.3, and whose vertical dislocation is six feet or larger. The first possibility has been discussed by Dr. Hadley, and I will address my remarks to the latter problem.

Despite the fact that there are no recognizable dissimilarities in the frequency or intensity of seismic activity along the Aleutian Arc, or in tectonic structure and incidence of vulcanism, there is no historical record of a destructive tsunami having been generated west of Amchitka Pass.

Since 1900, there have been about 60 earthquakes of magnitudes  $6.75 < M < 7.5$ , and 14 of magnitude 7.5 or larger. Three of the latter events have generated destructive tsunamis. Their rupture zones—as defined by the aftershock perimeters of their parent earthquakes—lie elbow to elbow, and encompass the entire Aleutian Arc from Prince William Sound to Amchitka Pass. Aside from the above-cited directional differences, remote wave effects from these three tsunamis were statistically indistinguishable.

The Rat Island Quake of February 4, 1965, had a magnitude of 7.5, an aftershock perimeter comparable to the above three tsunamigenic earthquakes, and encompassed the bulk of the Aleutian Arc west of Amchitka Pass. This earthquake generated a "moderate" tsunami, in that local tide gage heights of 0-10 feet, and extreme runup heights of 6-50<sup>1</sup> feet, were reported within the epicentral region, but no significant remote waves were observed.

Taken together, these factors imply that vertical dislocations associated with large Aleutian earthquakes west of Amchitka Pass are inherently smaller than those to the east. This view is also suggested by the directions of crustal plate movement in the North Pacific, which normally abut the eastern portion of the Aleutian Arc, but trend more tangentially in the western sector, such that lateral shear forces—rather than normal forces—can be expected to prevail.

To further explore these implied differences, the U.S. Geological Survey has recently conducted a field survey of the Island groups on both sides of Amchitka Pass, looking for specific evidence that might confirm or deny the hypothesis of relatively long-term vertical stability of the Amchitka sector. The following—still incomplete and unreported—results tend to support this hypothesis.<sup>2</sup>

1. There is a general concordance of the levels of the submarine and sea level terraces within and between the islands of the Rat Islands group and the Delarof Island group. A 10- to 15-foot uplift in the last 3,000 to 4,000 years of the Delarof group (east of Amchitka Pass) is indicated by the fact that sea cliffs are inactive and above wave action and the modern sea-level terrace is emergent, whereas in the Rat group (west of Amchitka Pass) sea cliffs are being actively eroded.

2. The elevations with respect to sea level of these marine terraces in the west-central

<sup>1</sup> Single observation at Shemya.

<sup>2</sup> Notes from discussions of 12/3/70 between U.S.G.S. representatives and Dr. W. G. Van Dorn.

Aleutian Islands roughly correlate with world-wide sea-level changes during the past 240,000 years postulated by Fairbridge.

3. A 1200-foot-wide block-slump of about 100 feet near South Bight, Amchitka Island, postdates older, transcurent faults. This slump comprises unconsolidated, multilayer, fossiliferous sediments that show no evidence of subsequent fractures. Two proactinium dates of about 130,000 years from this slump place an upper limit on significant fault activity on Amchitka.

4. There is no evidence of fault displacement of any of the marine terraces.

5. Local faulting was observed on some of the active volcanoes; this appears to be restricted to the volcanoes and is inferred to be unrelated to regional tectonic processes.

6. It is safe to conclude that the west-central Aleutians have not undergone isostatic adjustments within the past 2,000,000 years at the magnitude or frequency seen to the east in the coastlines of the islands and mainland in the Gulf of Alaska.

Further evidence regarding the time-scale of prehistoric changes in the geomorphology of this region should be provided by 35 samples currently being processed for radioactive dates. Additionally, a 4-station array of sensitive wave recorders is currently being installed on Western Pacific Islands, with the object of monitoring small or moderate tsunamis from the Aleutian group. These stations, combined with seismic data should provide data whereby Aleutian tsunami sources can be defined and compared for regional differences—if any.

If convincing differences between the long-term vertical stability of the geologic structure east and west of Amchitka Pass can be demonstrated, this evidence and the historical lack of destructive tsunamis from the western sector would provide considerable support to the arguments against significant tsunami risk in conjunction with Cannikin—whether or not a larger earthquake might be causatively imputed to this test. It would be highly desirable to extend the field surveys to the central Aleutian Arc, so far unstudied, looking for specific evidence of recent vertical dislocations of 6-16 feet, as implied from the tsunami-producing earthquakes of 1946 and 1957.

#### EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY,

Washington, D.C., May 6, 1971.

Mrs. JOSEPHINE POMERANCE,  
 Chairman, Disarmament Issues Committee,  
 United Nations Association of the United States of America, New York, N.Y.

DEAR Mrs. POMERANCE: I am writing in response to the letter of April 22, 1971, which you wrote as Chairman of the Disarmament Issues Committee of the United Nations Association of the United States of America, concerning compliance with the National Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) by the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) for the CANNIKIN test at Amchitka, Alaska. Since receipt of your letter the Council on Environmental Quality has reviewed the status of AEC compliance.

By way of background it should be mentioned that the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) was not officially formed until early 1970. One of the first official actions of the new Council was to draft guidelines for compliance with Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). Those guidelines were issued on April 30, 1970, to set forth the procedures for drafting, reviewing, and issuing environmental statements.

The AEC's draft environmental statement on CANNIKIN, submitted to the CEQ on June 17, 1970, was one of the earliest draft

\*The large 1946 Aleutian tsunami was anomalously low at M7.3.

environmental statements prepared in accordance with the CEQ guidelines. At the time the draft CANNIKIN statement was issued, the AEC published notice of the public availability of the statement in the *Federal Register* of June 20, 1970. At the same time the AEC sent copies of the draft statement to appropriate Federal agencies having jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to environmental impact, and to state and local agencies authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards including the State of Alaska and Hawaii.

Since release of the Cannikin draft statement, copies of that statement have been supplied by the AEC to over 300 individual requesters. Comments on the statement have been received from the Department of the Interior, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Defense, the Department of Transportation, the Department of State and from the State of Hawaii. It should be noted that the response from the Department of the Interior included comments provided by the Federal Water Quality Administration, and the response from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare included comments from the Public Health Service. With the more recent governmental reorganization these commenting bodies have been replaced by equivalent components within the Environmental Protection Agency.

The AEC has modified the Cannikin environmental statement to incorporate consideration of the comments that have been received. The revised Cannikin statement is nearing completion and will soon be approved for release by the AEC as their final statement. While the AEC has not yet published the final environmental statement for Cannikin, their performance will be consistent with the most recent revised guidelines of the Council on compliance with NEPA:

"(c) With respect to recommendations or reports on proposals for legislation to which section 102(2)(C) applies, the final text of the environmental statement and comments thereon should be available to the Congress and to the public in support of the proposed legislation or report. In cases where the scheduling of congressional hearings on recommendations or reports on proposals for legislation which the Federal agency has forwarded to the Congress does not allow adequate time for the completion of a final text of an environmental statement (together with comments), a draft environmental statement may be furnished to the Congress and made available to the public pending transmittal of the comments as received and the final text."

In your letter you indicated that the Congress was not satisfied with the Cannikin environmental statement and that they had dismissed it, withholding appropriations for the proposed Cannikin test. The Congressional action which was taken with regard to the Cannikin test was actually that of decreasing the appropriations in the FY 1971 budget, deferring those costs to the budget for FY 1972.

We have discussed the revised Cannikin environmental statement with representatives of the AEC. When the final Cannikin statement is issued, it is our understanding that it will indicate all potential hazards to the environment and it will address the alternatives to the action proposed. The final Cannikin statement will of course include copies of the comments which have been received and will be given official notice in the *Federal Register*.

By a copy of this letter to the AEC I am asking that copies of the revised AEC Cannikin statement and comments be furnished

directly to you and all those who joined in your letter.

Sincerely,  
RUSSELL E. TRAIN, *Chairman.*

#### THE OPENING OF THE SUEZ CANAL

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HAMILTON, is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is in the United States' national interest to have the Suez Canal open.

In recent weeks, the argument has been advanced that the opening of the Suez Canal in connection with an interim settlement in the Middle East would be in the interest of the Soviet Union and, therefore, disadvantageous to the United States. This argument holds that an open canal would help the Russians gain a strategic foothold in the Indian Ocean and would facilitate the delivery of materiel to North Vietnam.

An open canal would afford distinct advantages to the U.S.S.R. It would facilitate and shorten its naval routes and communications, reduce costs, and increase the mobility of its naval forces. These advantages to the U.S.S.R. should not, however, be exaggerated, and should be kept in perspective. Soviet force levels in the Indian Ocean area and deliveries of supplies to North Vietnam are independent of the status of the Suez Canal. Since the 1967 Middle East war, Soviet presence in the Indian Ocean and deliveries to Southeast Asia have increased—at the precise time the canal was closed. The opening of the canal would not present the Soviets with new capabilities that they are currently without. Thus, the opening of the Suez Canal would represent mainly a logistical advantage for Russia: the open canal would be convenient but not essential. Furthermore, the difference between an open and a closed canal is not of major significance in terms of the overall U.S.-U.S.S.R. strategic balance.

But the opening of the canal would have many advantages for the United States. Among the most significant are these:

First. The United States has an overriding interest in peace in the Middle East. The opening of the canal, as part of an interim solution, could break the present impasse in negotiations, improve the climate for peace, and provide a crucial stepping stone toward a political settlement.

Second. An open canal would be a mortgage for peace on all sides of the Arab-Israeli conflict. As long as the canal would be open, parties would have a vested interest in keeping it so. The greater the vested interest of all parties in an open canal, the less the chances of further Egyptian-Israeli hostilities and a big power confrontation in the region.

Third. Both Israel and Egypt want the canal open. Because the parties agree on this matter, the United States would not be imposing any kind of a solution

by urging the parties to pursue efforts to open the canal. Indeed, it is a premise of United States policy not to impose any course of action on the parties involved.

Fourth. An open canal would be a major economic benefit to our West European allies. The economic loss to the world economy because of the canal's closure has been around \$3 billion annually; about \$1.8 billion of this loss has been suffered directly by Western Europe—a loss approximately 20 times greater than any loss to a Communist state. The following two factors, involving the oil industry, are responsible for much of this loss to Europe:

The oil tanker supply today is barely sufficient and there are few or no tankers in reserve, with few supertankers under construction. Because tankers are so much in demand for the long trip around Africa, transport costs since 1967 have fluctuated between doubling and quadrupling. It is estimated that an open canal would attract about 80 percent of the oil trade from the Persian Gulf and increase by about 10 percent the tanker reserve fleet, thus reducing transport costs.

In Western Europe, oil consumption has increased at a pace greater than supply, creating a sellers' market—the Alaska and North Sea fields will not be producing at full capacity until 1975 and, even then, their output will not keep pace with demand increase in the Western world. Because the canal is closed, North African producers have been able to force higher prices. An open canal would reduce both the chances of blackmail in the world oil industry and the leverage of North Africa on the industry.

Fifth. An open canal would aid the economic development, trade and prosperity of the countries of the Indian Ocean and Red Sea, many of which are important friends of the United States, among them are India, Ethiopia, and Kenya. These countries do a great deal of trade with Western Europe.

Sixth. Freedom of access to the seas, expanded trade and free communications have long been in the U.S. interests, and a closed canal operates against these important concerns.

In sum, while an open Suez Canal would give the Soviet Union increased mobility and flexibility, it would not give it any new capability and would not represent a new threat. The U.S. overriding commitment to and interest in peace in the Middle East and the excessive economic loss to the free world because of the canal's closure clearly indicate that, on balance, it is in the U.S. national interest to have the canal open.

#### SUBSTANTIAL UNEMPLOYMENT INCREASES

(Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey Mr.

Speaker, according to a news release from the Department of Labor, 52 major labor areas have been added to the "substantial unemployment" category of 6 percent or higher unemployment which is expected to continue for at least 2 months. This is the highest total of substantial unemployment areas since May 1962. Last year, the total of substantial unemployment areas included only 11 major labor areas—an increase of over 400 percent unemployment in major metropolitan centers. Furthermore, the Department of Labor divides the country into 150 major labor areas to reflect national trends and this current figure indicates that one-third of the national labor centers is in the substantial unemployment list. In addition to the figure of the substantial unemployment areas are the figures for the areas of "persistent unemployment" in which the unemployment rate has been 6 percent or higher for a year and 50 percent above the national average for several years. "Persistent unemployment" areas include not only six major metropolitan areas but also 484 smaller nonmetropolitan centers.

These statistics are staggering and represent a problem of national dimensions. As the following tables indicate, the employment crisis affects us all. I would, therefore, urge my colleagues to support my bill, H.R. 3613, to provide public service employment when it comes to the House floor for a vote. The unemployed worker deserves our immediate consideration and any delay in providing assistance would violate our public responsibility.

The tables follow:

AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL UNEMPLOYMENT, GEOGRAPHICAL BOUNDARIES, APRIL 1971

[Except as noted, for procurement purposes these classifications are effective May 1, 1971]

Labor area <sup>1</sup> (Political Subdivisions included)	Substantial	Persistent
<b>ALABAMA</b>		
Centre (Cherokee County)		X
Cullman (Cullman County)	X	
Eutaw (Greene County)		X
Florence-Sheffield (Colbert, Franklin, and Lauderdale Counties)	X	
Gadsden (Etowah County)*	X	
Lawrence County		X
Pell City (St. Clair County)	X	
Roanoke (Randolph County)	X	
Vernon (Lamar County)	X	
<b>ALASKA</b>		
Aleutian Islands (Elect. Dist. 14)	X	
Anchorage (Elect. Dist. 10)	X	
Barrow (Elect. Dist. 21)	X	
Bethel (Elect. Dist. 16)	X	
Bristol Bay (Elect. Dist. 15)	X	
Cordova-McCarthy (Elect. Dist. 7)	X	
Fairbanks (Elect. Dist. 19)	X	
Kenai-Cook Inlet (Elect. Dist. 12)	X	
Ketchikan (Elect. Dist. 2)	X	
Kobuk (Elect. Dist. 22)	X	
Kodiak (Elect. Dist. 13)	X	
Kuskokwim (Elect. Dist. 17)	X	
Lynn Canal-Icy Straits (Elect. Dist. 6)	X	
Nome (Elect. Dist. 23)	X	

See footnotes at end of table.

Labor area <sup>1</sup> (Political Subdivisions included)	Substantial	Persistent
Palmer-Telkeetna (Elect. Dist. 9)		X
Prince of Wales (Elect. Dist. 1)		X
Seward (Elect. Dist. 11)		X
Sitka (Elect. Dist. 4)		X
Upper Yukon (Elect. Dist. 20)		X
Valdez-Whittier (Elect. Dist. 8)		X
Wade Hampton (Elect. Dist. 24)		X
Wrangell-Petersburg (Elect. Dist. 3)		X
Yukon-Koyukuk (Elect. Dist. 18)		X
<b>ARIZONA</b>		
Kingman (Mohave County)	X	
McNary (Apache County)		X
Safford (Graham County)	X	
Winslow (Navajo County)		X
<b>ARKANSAS</b>		
Ashdown (Little River County)	X	
Batesville (Independence County)		X
Berryville (Carroll County)		X
Camden (Calhoun & Ouachita Counties)	X	
Clarksville (Johnson County)		X
Crawford County		X
Fort Smith (Crawford and Sebastian Counties, Ark., LeFlore and Sequoyah Counties, Okla.)	X	
Hardy (Sharp County)		X
Malvern (Hot Spring County)		X
Marshall (Searcy County)		X
Melbourne (Izard County)		X
Mena (Polk County)	X	
Mountain View (Stone County)		X
Ozark (Franklin County)		X
Paris (Logan County)		X
Pocahontas (Randolph County)		X
Searcy (White County)		X
Walnut Ridge (Lawrence County) (See also Texas-Texas)		X
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>		
Alturas (Modoc County)		X
Anaheim-Santa Ana-Garden Grove (Orange County)*	X	
Bakersfield (Kern County)*	X	
Chico-Oroville (Butte County)		X
Crescent City (Del Norte County)		X
El Centro (Imperial County)		X
Eureka (Humboldt County)		X
Fresno (Fresno County)*		X
Grass Valley (Nevada County)		X
Hollister (San Benito County)		X
Lakeport (Lake County)		X
Los Angeles-Long Beach (Los Angeles County)*	X	
Madera (Madera County)		X
Mariposa (Mariposa County)		X
Merced (Merced County)		X
Modesto (Stanislaus County)*		X
City of Oakland*		X
Oxnard (Ventura County)*	X	
Placer County		X
Placerville (El Dorado County)		X
Quincy Plumas County		X
Red Bluff (Tehama County)		X
Redding (Shasta County)		X
Sacramento (Placer, Sacramento, and Yolo Counties)*	X	
Salinas-Monterey (Monterey County)*	X	
San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario (Riverside and San Bernardino Counties)*	X	
San Diego (San Diego County)*	X	
San Jose (Santa Clara County)*	X	
Santa Cruz (Santa Cruz County)		X
Santa Rosa (Sonoma County)*		X
Sonora (Tuolumne County)		X
Stockton (San Joaquin County)*		X
Susanville (Lassen County)		X
Ukiah (Mendocino County)		X
Weaverville (Trinity County)		X
Willows (Glenn County)		X
Yreka (Siskiyou County)		X
Yuba City (Sutter and Yuba Counties)		X
<b>COLORADO</b>		
Antonito (Conejos County)		X
Bianca (Costilla County)		X
Center (Saguache County)		X
Ordway (Crowley County)		X
Pagosa Springs (Archuleta County)		X
Trinidad (Las Animas County)	X	
Walsenburg (Huerfano County)		X
<b>CONNECTICUT</b>		
Ansonia (Towns of Ansonia, Derby, Oxford, and Seymour in New Haven County)		X

Labor area <sup>1</sup> (Political Subdivisions included)	Substantial	Persistent
Bridgeport (Towns of Bridgeport, Easton, Fairfield, Monroe, Shelton, Stratford, and Trumbull in Fairfield County; Town of Milford in New Haven County)*	X	
Bristol (City of Bristol and Plymouth Town)*		X
Danbury (Towns of Bethel, Brookfield, Danbury, New Fairfield, Newton, Redding, Ridgefield, and Sherman in Fairfield County; Towns of Bridgewater, Kent, New Milford, Roxbury, Warren, and Washington in Litchfield County)*	X	
Danielson (Towns of Brooklyn, Canterbury, Eastford, Killingly, Plainfield, Pomfret, Putnam, Sterling, Thompson, and Woodstock in Windham County)		X
Hartford (Towns of Avon, Bloomfield, Canton, East Granby, East Hartford, East Windsor, Enfield, Farmington, Glastonbury, Granby, Hartford, Manchester, Newington, Rocky Hill, Simsbury, South Windsor, Suffield, West Hartford, Wethersfield, Windsor, and Windsor Locks in Hartford County; Towns of Bolton, Ellington, Somers, Stafford, Tolland, and Vernon in Tolland County)*	X	
Meriden (town of Southington in Hartford County; towns of Meriden and Wallingford in New Haven County)*		X
Middletown (town of Marlborough in Hartford County; Middlesex County)		X
New Britain (towns of Berlin, New Britain, and Plainville in Hartford County)*	X	
New Haven (towns of Bethany, Branford, East Haven, Guilford, Hamden, Madison, New Haven, North Branford, North Haven, Orange, West Haven, and Woodbridge in New Haven County)*	X	
Norwich (towns of Bozrah, Colchester, Franklin, Griswold, Lisbon, Norwich, Preston, Sprague, and Voluntown in New London County)		X
Torrington (towns of Burlington and Hartland in Hartford County; towns of Barkhamsted, Canaan, Colebrook, Cornwall, Goshen, Harwinton, Litchfield Morris, New Hartford, Norfolk, North Canaan, Salisbury, Sharon, Torrington, and Winchester in Litchfield County)	X	
Waterbury (towns of Bethlehem, Thomaston, Watertown, and Woodbury in Litchfield County; towns of Beacon Falls, Cheshire, Middletown, Naugatuck, Prospect, Southbury, Waterbury, and Wolcott in New Haven County)*	X	
<b>FLORIDA</b>		
Aplachicola (Franklin County)		X
Blountstown (Calhoun County)		X
Bonifay (Holmes County)		X
Cocoa (Brevard County)		X
Lakeland (Polk County)		X
<b>GEORGIA</b>		
Blackshear (Pierce County)		X
Blairsville (Union County)		X
Camilla (Mitchell County)		X
Cedartown (Polk County)		X
Chatsworth (Murray County)		X
Cleeland (White County)		X
Colquitt (Miller County)		X
Cumming (Forsyth County)		X
Dallas (Paulding County)		X
Douglasville (Douglas County)		X
Eastman (Dodge County)		X
Fitzgerald (Ben Hill County)		X
Fort Gaines (Clay County)		X
Gibson (Glascok County)		X
Hawkinsville (Pulaski County)		X
Homerville (Clinch County)	X	
Lakeland (Lanier County)		X
Ludowici (Long County)		X
Manchester (Meriwether County)		X
McCaysville (Fannin County)		X
Nahunta (Brantley County)		X
Pembroke (Bryan County)	X	
Soperton (Treutlen County)		X
Young Harris (Towns County)		X
Zebulon (Pike County)		X
<b>IDAHO</b>		
Council (Adams County)		X
Driggs (Teton County)		X
Grangeville (Idaho County)		X
Jerome (Jerome County)	X	
Horseshoe Bend (Boise County)		X
McCall (Valley County)		X
Orofino (Clearwater County)		X
St. Maries (Benewah County and Avery-Clarkia Division of Shoshone County)		X
Sandpoint (Bonner County)		X
<b>ILLINOIS</b>		
Anna (Union County)		X
Cairo (Alexander and Pulaski Counties)		X

Labor area 1 (Political Subdivisions included)	Substantial	Persistent	Labor area 1 (Political Subdivisions included)	Substantial	Persistent	Labor area 1 (Political Subdivisions included)	Substantial	Persistent
Carmi (White County).....	X		Arcadia (Bienville Parish).....		X	Lawrence-Haverhill (cities of Lawrence and Haverhill, Towns of Andover, Georgetown, Groveland, Merrimac, Methuen, North Andover, and West Newbury in Essex County, Mass.; Towns of Newton, Plaistow, and Salem in Rockingham County, N.H.).....		X
Centralia (Clinton and Marion Counties).....	X		Baton Rouge (East Baton Rouge Parish)*.....	X		Lowell (City of Lowell, towns of Billerica, Chelmsford, Dracut, Tewksbury, Tyngsborough, and Westford in Middlesex County)*.....	X	
Danville (Vermillion County).....	X		Columbia (Caldwell Parish).....		X	Marlboro (City of Marlboro, Towns of Acton, Hudson, Maynard, and Stow in Middlesex County; Towns of Bolton and Southborough in Worcester County).....	X	
Du Quoin (Perry County).....		X	Crowley (Acadia Parish).....		X	Milford (Town of Medway in Norfolk County; Towns of Hopedale, Mendon, Milford, and Uxbridge in Worcester County).....		X
Goconda (Pope County).....		X	Denham Springs (Livingston Parish).....		X	New Bedford (City of New Bedford, Towns of Acushnet, Dartmouth, and Fairhaven in Bristol County; Towns of Marion and Matapoisett in Plymouth County)*.....		X
Hardin (Calhoun County).....		X	De Ridder (Beauregard Parish).....		X	Newburyport (City of Newburyport, Towns of Amesbury, Ipswich, Newbury, Rowley, and Salisbury in Essex County).....		X
Harrisburg-West Frankfort-Herrin (Franklin, Johnson, Saline, and Williamson Counties).....		X	Donaldsonville (Ascension Parish).....		X	North Adams (City of North Adams, Towns of Adams, Clarksburg, Florida, New Ashford, Savoy, and Williamston in Berkshire County; town of Monroe in Franklin County).....		X
Jerseyville (Jersey County).....		X	Farmerville (Union Parish).....		X	Plymouth (towns of Carver, Kingston, Plymouth and Plympton in Plymouth County).....		X
McLeansboro (Hamilton County).....		X	Ferriday (Catahoula and Concordia Parishes).....		X	Provincetown (towns of Provincetown and Truro in Barnstable County).....		X
Ottawa-La Salle (Bureau, La Salle, and Putnam Counties).....	X		Greensburg (St. Helena Parish).....		X	Southbridge-Webster (Towns of Charlton, Douglas, Dudley, Southbridge, Sturbridge, and Webster in Worcester County).....		X
Rockford (Boone and Winnebago Counties)*.....	X		Hammond (Tangipahoa Parish).....		X	Springfield-Holyoke (cities of Chicopee, Holyoke, Springfield, and Westfield, towns of Agawam, East Longmeadow, Hampden, Longmeadow, Ludlow, Monson, Palmer, Southwick, West Springfield, and Wilbraham in Hampden County; City of Northampton, Towns of Easthampton, Granby, Hadley, and South Hadley in Hampshire County; Town of Warren in Worcester County).....		X
Rosiclare (Hardin County).....		X	Jennings (Jefferson Davis Parish).....		X	Taunton (City of Taunton, Towns of Berkeley, Dighton, Norton, and Raynham in Bristol County; Towns of Halifax, Middleborough, and Lakerville in Plymouth County).....		X
Shawneetown (Gallatin County).....		X	Lake Charles (Calcasieu Parish)*.....		X	Ware (Towns of Brimfield, Holland, and Wales in Hampden County; Towns of Belchertown and Ware in Hampshire County; Towns of Hardwick, New Braintree, Oakham, and West Brookfield in Worcester County).....		X
St. Clair County.....		X	Leesville (Vernon Parish).....		X	Worcester (City of Worcester, Towns of Auburn, Berlin, Boylston, Brookfield, East Brookfield, Grafton, Holden, Leicester, Millbury, Northborough, Northbridge, North Brookfield, Oxford, Paxton, Shrewsbury, Spencer, Sterling, Sutton, Upton, Westborough, and West Boylston in Worcester County)*.....		X
INDIANA			Mansfield (De Soto Parish).....		X	MICHIGAN		
Bedford (Lawrence County).....		X	Many (Sabine Parish).....		X	Adrian (Lenawee County).....		X
Clay County.....		X	Minden (Webster Parish).....		X	Alger County.....		X
Knox (Starke County).....		X	Monroe (Ouachita Parish)*.....		X	Allegan (Allegan County).....		X
Lawrenceburg (Dearborn and Ohio Counties).....		X	Napoleonville (Assumption Parish).....		X	Alma (Grafton County).....		X
Linton (Greene County).....		X	Natchitoches (Natchitoches Parish).....		X	Alpena (Alpena County).....		X
Marengo (Crawford County).....		X	New Roads (Pointe Coupee Parish).....		X	Bad Axe (Huron County).....		X
Michigan City-La Porte (La Porte County).....	X		Oakdale (Allen Parish).....		X	Baldwin (Lake County).....		X
Scottsburg (Scott County)*.....		X	Oak Grove (West Carroll Parish).....		X	Battle Creek (Barry and Calhoun Counties)*.....		X
South Bend (Marshall and St. Joseph Counties).....	X		Opelousas (St. Landry Parish).....		X	Bay City (Bay County)*.....		X
Terre Haute (Clay, Sullivan, Vermillion and Vigo Counties)*.....	X		Plaquemine (Iberville Parish).....		X	Benton Harbor (Berrien County).....		X
Vermillion County.....		X	Rayville (Richland Parish).....		X	Big Rapids (Mecosta County).....		X
IOWA			Reserve (St. John the Baptist Parish).....		X	Boyer City (Charlevoix County).....		X
Waterloo (Black Hawk County).....	X		St. Francisville (West Feliciana Parish).....		X	Cadillac (Missaukee, Osceola, and Wexford Counties).....		X
KANSAS			St. Martinville (St. Martin Parish).....		X	Caro (Tuscola County).....		X
Coffeyville (Montgomery County).....		X	Ville Platte (Evangeline Parish).....		X	Cheboygan (Cheboygan County).....		X
Parsons (Labette County).....		X	Winnboro (Franklin Parish).....		X	Clare (Clare County).....		X
Wellington (Sumner County).....		X	MAINE			Goldwater (Branch County).....		X
Wichita (Butler and Sedgwick Counties)*.....		X	Belfast (Waldo County).....		X	Detroit (Macomb, Oakland, and Wayne Counties)*.....		X
Albany (Clinton County).....		X	Biddeford-Sanford (Cities of Biddeford and Saco, Towns of Action, Alfred, Arundel, Buxton, Cornish, Dayton, Hollis, Kennebunk Kennebunkport, Lebanon, Limerick, Limington, Lyman, Newfield, North Berwick, Old Orchard Beach, Parsonfield, Sanford, Shapleigh, and Waterboro in York County).....		X	East Tawas (Alcona and Iosco Counties).....		X
Barbourville (Knox County).....		X	Calais-Eastport (Washington County).....		X	Eibelta (Benzie County).....		X
Bardonia (Nelson County).....		X	Dover-Foxcroft (Piscataquis County except Southwest portion—Greenville area).....		X	Escanaba (Delta County).....		X
Bardwell (Carlisle County).....		X	Elsworth (Hancock County).....		X	Flint (Genesee and Lapeer Counties)*.....		X
Booneville (Owsley County).....		X	Fort Kent (Towns of Eagle Lake, Fort Kent, Frenchville, St. Agatha, and Allagash, New Canada, St. John, St. Francis, and Wallagrass Plantations in Aroostook County).....		X	Fremont (Newaygo County).....		X
Brownsville (Edmonson County).....		X	Greenville (Organized Towns of Elliottsville, Greenville, Lily Bay, Shirley; Unorganized Towns of Big Squaw, Frenchtown, Little Squaw, and T.A.-2, R.13 and R.14 in Piscataquis County).....		X	Gaylord (Otsego County).....		X
Burkesville (Cumberland County).....	X		Lewiston-Auburn (Cities of Auburn and Lewiston, Town of Lisbon in Androscoggin County)*.....		X	Grand Rapids (Kent and Ottawa Counties)*.....		X
Cadiz (Trigg County).....		X	Madawaska-Van Buren (Towns of Grand Isle, Madawaska, Van Buren, and Cyr and Hamlin Plantations in Aroostook County).....		X	Grayling (Crawford County).....		X
Campton (Wolfe County).....		X	Rockland (Knox County; Town of Waldoboro in Lincoln County).....		X	Hancock (Houghton and Keweenaw Counties).....		X
Corbin (Whitley County).....		X	Skowhegan (Somerset County).....		X	Hart (Oceana County).....		X
Dixon (Webster County).....		X	MARYLAND			Hillsdale (Hillsdale County).....		X
Eddyville (Lyon County).....		X	Cambridge (Dorchester County).....		X	Hillman (Monmorency County).....		X
Edmonton (Metcalfe County).....		X	Chestertown (Kent County).....		X	Ionia-Belding-Greenville (Ionia and Montcalm Counties).....		X
Flatwoods (Greenup County).....		X	Crisfield (Somerset County).....		X	Iron Mountain (Dickinson County).....		X
Fulton (Fulton and Hickman Counties).....	X		Hagerstown (Washington County).....		X	Iron River (Iron County).....		X
Grayson (Carter and Elliot Counties).....		X	Oakland (Garrett County).....		X	Ironwood (Gogebig County).....		X
Georgetown (Scott County).....	X		Pocomoke City (Worcester County).....		X	Jackson (Jackson County)*.....		X
Hardinsburg (Breckinridge County).....		X	Prince Frederick (Calvert County).....		X	Kalamazoo (Kalamazoo County)*.....		X
Harlan (Harlan County).....		X	MASSACHUSETTS			L'Anse (Baraga County).....		X
Hartford (Ohio County).....		X	Bourne-Wareham (Town of Bourne in Barnstable County; Towns of Rochester and Wareham in Plymouth County).....		X			
Hazard (Knott and Perry Counties).....		X	Brocton (towns of Easton in Bristol County; Towns of Avon and Stoughton in Norfolk County; City of Brocton, towns of Abington, Bridgewater, East Bridgewater, Hanson, West Bridgewater, and Whitman in Plymouth County)*.....		X			
Hyden (Leslie County).....		X	Fall River (City of Fall River, towns of Somerset, Swansea, and Westport in Bristol County, Mass.; Town of Tiverton in Newport County, R.I.)*.....		X			
Inez (Martin County).....		X	Fitchburg-Leominster (Towns of Shirley and Townsend in Middlesex County; Cities of Fitchburg and Leominster, towns of Lunenburg and Westminster in Worcester County)*.....		X			
Jackson (Breathitt County).....		X	Gloucester (City of Gloucester, Towns of Essex and Rockport in Essex County).....		X			
Jenkins (Letcher County).....		X	Greenfield (Franklin County, except Towns of Erving, Monroe, New Salem, Orange, Warwick, and Wendell).....		X			
Lancaster (Garrard County).....	X							
Lebanon (Marion County).....		X						
Leitchfield (Grayson County).....		X						
Leitchfield (Grayson County).....		X						
Louisa (Lawrence County).....		X						
Manchester (Clay County).....		X						
Mayfield (Graves County).....		X						
McCleary County.....		X						
Middlesboro (Bell County).....		X						
Monticello (Wayne County).....		X						
Morehead (Bath, Menifee, and Rowan Counties).....		X						
Morgantown (Butler County).....		X						
Nicholasville (Jessamine County).....		X						
Paintsville (Johnson County).....		X						
Pikeville (Pike County).....		X						
Prestonsburg (Floyd County).....		X						
Princeton (Caldwell County).....		X						
Richmond (Estill, Jackson, Madison, and Rockcastle Counties).....	X							
Russell Springs (Russell County).....		X						
Salversville (Magoffin County).....		X						
Smithland (Livingston County).....		X						
Springfield (Washington County).....		X						
Stamford (Lincoln County).....		X						
Stanton (Powell County).....		X						
West Liberty (Morgan County).....		X						
Whitley City (McCreary County) (See also West Virginia-Huntington-Ashland).....		X						
LOUISIANA								
Abbeville (Vermilion Parish).....		X						
Alexandria (Avoyelles, Grant, and Rapides Parishes).....		X						

See footnotes at end of table. CXVII—1020—Part 12

AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL UNEMPLOYMENT, GEOGRAPHICAL BOUNDARIES, APRIL 1971—Continued

[Except as noted, for procurement purposes these classifications are effective May 1, 1971]

Labor area <sup>1</sup> (Political Subdivisions included)	Substantial	Persistent
MICHIGAN—Continued		
Ludington (Mason County).....	×	×
Mancelona (Antrim County).....	×	×
Manistee (Manistee County).....	×	×
Manistique (Schoolcraft).....	×	×
Marquette (Alger and Marquette Counties).....	×	×
Mio (Oscoda County).....	×	×
Muskegon-Muskegon Heights (Muskegon County)*.....	×	×
Newberry (Luce County).....	×	×
Owosso (Shiawassee County).....	×	×
Petoskey (Emmet County).....	×	×
Port Huron (St. Clair County).....	×	×
Rogers City (Presque Isle County).....	×	×
Roscommon (Roscommon County).....	×	×
St. Ignace (Macinac County).....	×	×
Sandusky (Sanilac County).....	×	×
Sault Ste. Marie (Chippewa County).....	×	×
Standish (Arenac County).....	×	×
Traverse City (Grand Traverse, Kalkaska, and Leelanau Counties).....	×	×
West Branch (Ogemaw County).....	×	×
Aitkin (Aitkin County).....	×	×
Bagley (Clearwater County).....	×	×
Baudette (Lake of the Woods County).....	×	×
Bemidji (Beltrami County).....	×	×
Brainerd (Crow Wing County).....	×	×
Buffalo (Wright County).....	×	×
Cambridge (Isanti County).....	×	×
Crookston (Polk County).....	×	×
Detroit Lakes (Becker County).....	×	×
Faribault (Rice County).....	×	×
Grand Rapids (Itasca County).....	×	×
Hallock (Kittson County).....	×	×
Little Falls (Morrison County).....	×	×
Mahnomen (Mahnomen County).....	×	×
Mora (Kanabec County).....	×	×
Park Rapids (Hubbard County).....	×	×
Pine City (Pine County).....	×	×
Princeton (Mille Lacs County).....	×	×
Red Lake Falls (Red Lake County).....	×	×
Roseau (Roseau County).....	×	×
Rush City (Chisago County).....	×	×
Wadena (Wadena County).....	×	×
Walker (Cass County).....	×	×
Warren (Marshall County).....	×	×
MISSISSIPPI		
Columbia (Marion County).....	×	×
Kosciusko (Attala County).....	×	×
Leakesville (Greene County).....	×	×
Lucedale (George County).....	×	×
Lumberton (Lamar County).....	×	×
Waynesboro (Wayne County).....	×	×
MISSOURI		
Branson (Taney County).....	×	×
Buffalo (Dallas County).....	×	×
Charleston (Mississippi County).....	×	×
Doniphan (Ripley County).....	×	×
Eldon (Miller County).....	×	×
Eminence (Shannon County).....	×	×
Flat River (St. Francois County).....	×	×
Greenville (Wayne County).....	×	×
Potosi (Washington County).....	×	×
Rolla (PHELPS County).....	×	×
St. Joseph (Buchanan County)*.....	×	×
MONTANA		
Butte (Silver Bow County).....	×	×
Columbus (Stillwater County).....	×	×
Cut Bank (Glacier County).....	×	×
Glasgow (Valley County).....	×	×
Livingston (Park County).....	×	×
Philipsburg (Granite County).....	×	×
Red Lodge (Carbon County).....	×	×
Roundup (Musselshell County).....	×	×
Sheridan (Maidson County).....	×	×
White Sulphur Springs (Meagher County).....	×	×
NEVADA		
Caliente (Lincoln County).....	×	×
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
Franklin-Tilton (Parts of Merrimack and Belknap Counties) (See Massachusetts-Lawrence-Haverhill).....	×	×
NEW JERSEY		
Atlantic City (Atlantic County)*.....	×	×
City of Newark <sup>2</sup> .....	×	×
Flemington (Hunterdon County).....	×	×
Jersey City (Hudson County)*.....	×	×

See footnotes at end of table.

Labor area <sup>1</sup> (Political Subdivisions included)	Substantial	Persistent
Lakewood-Toms River (Ocean County).....	×	×
Long Branch (Monmouth County).....	×	×
Newark (Essex, Morris, and Union Counties)*.....	×	×
New Brunswick-Perth Amboy (Middlesex and Somerset Counties)*.....	×	×
Newton (Sussex County).....	×	×
Ocean City-Wildwood-Cape May (Cape May County).....	×	×
Paterson-Clifton-Passaic (Bergen and Passaic Counties).....	×	×
Vineland-Millville-Bridgeton (Cumberland County)*.....	×	×
NEW MEXICO		
Alamogordo (Otero County).....	×	×
Albuquerque (Bernalillo County)*.....	×	×
Bernalillo (Sandoval County).....	×	×
Carlsbad (Eddy County).....	×	×
Deming (Luna County).....	×	×
Espanola (Rio Arriba County).....	×	×
Farlington (San Juan County).....	×	×
Gallup (McKinley County).....	×	×
Grants (Valencia County).....	×	×
Las Vegas (San Miguel County).....	×	×
Mountainair (Torrance County).....	×	×
Raton (Colfax County).....	×	×
Ruidoso (Lincoln County).....	×	×
Santa Fe (Santa Fe County).....	×	×
Santa Rosa (Guadalupe County).....	×	×
Socorro (Socorro County).....	×	×
Taos (Taos County).....	×	×
Wagon Mound (Mora County).....	×	×
NEW YORK		
Auburn (Cayuga County).....	×	×
Batavia (Genesee County).....	×	×
Binghamton (Broome and Tioga Counties, N.Y.; Susquehanna County, Pa.)*.....	×	×
Buffalo (Erie and Niagara Counties)*.....	×	×
Catskill (Greene County).....	×	×
Cobleskill (Schoharie County).....	×	×
Gloversville (Fulton County).....	×	×
Hudson (Columbia County).....	×	×
Jamestown-Dunkirk (Chautauque County).....	×	×
Kingston (Ulster County).....	×	×
Norwich (Chenango County).....	×	×
Ogdensburg-Massena-Malone (Franklin and St. Lawrence Counties).....	×	×
Olean-Salamanca (Cattaraugus County).....	×	×
Oneonta (Otsego County).....	×	×
Orleans County.....	×	×
Oswego County.....	×	×
Perry (Wyoming County).....	×	×
Plattsburgh (Clinton County).....	×	×
Sidney (Delaware County).....	×	×
Speculator (Hamilton County).....	×	×
Ticonderoga (Essex County).....	×	×
Utica-Rome (Herkimer and Oneida Counties)*.....	×	×
Warren County.....	×	×
Watertown (Jefferson County).....	×	×
NORTH CAROLINA		
Ahoskie (Hertford County).....	×	×
Bryson City (Swain County).....	×	×
Camden County.....	×	×
Columbia (Tyrrell County).....	×	×
Elizabethtown (Bladen County).....	×	×
Greenville (Pitt County).....	×	×
Haysville (Clay County).....	×	×
Lumberton (Robeson County).....	×	×
Manteo (Dare County).....	×	×
Marshall (Madison County).....	×	×
Moyock (Currituck County).....	×	×
Pamlico County.....	×	×
Robbinsville (Graham County).....	×	×
Roxboro (Person County).....	×	×
Snow Hill (Greene County).....	×	×
Whiteville (Columbus County).....	×	×
Williamston-Plymouth (Martin and Washington Counties).....	×	×
Wilson (Wilson County).....	×	×
Windsor (Bertie County).....	×	×
NORTH DAKOTA		
Rolla (Roulette County).....	×	×
OHIO		
Carrollton (Carroll County).....	×	×
City of Cleveland <sup>2</sup> .....	×	×
Clermont County.....	×	×
Gallipolis (Gallia County).....	×	×
Jackson (Jackson County).....	×	×
Lawrence County.....	×	×
Manchester (Adams County).....	×	×
New Lexington (Perry County).....	×	×
Pomeroy (Meigs County).....	×	×
Warren County.....	×	×
Waverly (Pike County) (See also West Virginia-Huntington-Ashland).....	×	×
Ada (Pontotoc County).....	×	×
Anadarko (Caddo County).....	×	×
Atoka (Atoka County).....	×	×
Cheyenne (Roger Mills County).....	×	×
Claremore (Rogers County).....	×	×
Coalgate (Coal County).....	×	×
Cordell (Washita County).....	×	×
Elk City (Beckham County).....	×	×
Holdenville (Hughes County).....	×	×
Hugo (Choctaw County).....	×	×
Idabel (McCurtain County).....	×	×
Jay (Delaware County).....	×	×
LeFlore County.....	×	×
McAlester (Pittsburg County).....	×	×
Miami (Ottawa County).....	×	×
Muskogee (Muskogee County).....	×	×
Okemah (Okfuskee County).....	×	×
Okmulgee-Henryetta (Okmulgee County).....	×	×
Pawnee (Pawnee County).....	×	×
Pryor Creek (Mayes County).....	×	×
Purcell (McCain County).....	×	×
Seminole (Seminole County).....	×	×
Sequoyah County.....	×	×
Shawnee (Pottawatomie County).....	×	×
Stigler (Haskell County).....	×	×
Stillwell (Adair County).....	×	×
Tahlequah (Cherokee County).....	×	×
Tishomingo (Johnston County).....	×	×
Wagoner (Wagoner County).....	×	×
Waurika (Jefferson County).....	×	×
Wilburton (Latimer County).....	×	×
OREGON		
Albany (Linn County).....	×	×
Astoria (Clatsop County).....	×	×
Baker (Baker County).....	×	×
Condon (Gilliam County).....	×	×
Enterprise (Wallowa County).....	×	×
Eugene (Lane County)*.....	×	×
Fossil (Wheeler County).....	×	×
Gold Beach (Curry County).....	×	×
Grants Pass (Josephine County).....	×	×
Hood River (Hood River County).....	×	×
Klamath Falls (Klamath County).....	×	×
La Grande (Union County).....	×	×
Lakeview (Lake County).....	×	×
Madras (Jefferson County).....	×	×
Medford (Jackson County).....	×	×
McMinnville (Yamhill County).....	×	×
North Bend-Coos Bay (Coos County).....	×	×
Pendleton (Umatilla County).....	×	×
Portland (Clackamas Multnomah and Washington Counties Oreg.; Clark County Wash.)*.....	×	×
Roseburg (Douglas County).....	×	×
Salem (Marion and Polk Counties)*.....	×	×
St. Helens (Columbia County).....	×	×
The Dalles (Sherman and Wasco Counties).....	×	×
Tillamook (Tillamook County).....	×	×
Toledo (Lincoln County).....	×	×
PENNSYLVANIA		
Bedford (Bedford County).....	×	×
Bradford (McKean County).....	×	×
Clearfield-Du Bois (Clearfield County; Rush Township, Boroughs of Philipsburg and South Philipsburg in Centre County).....	×	×
Coudersport (Potter County).....	×	×
Johnstown (Cambria and Somerset Counties)*.....	×	×
Kittanning-Ford City (Armstrong County).....	×	×
Lock Haven-Renovo (Clinton County).....	×	×
Sayre-Athens-Towanda (Bradford County).....	×	×
Scranton (Lackawanna County)*.....	×	×
Tunkhannock (Wyoming County).....	×	×
Uniontown-Connellsville (Fayette County).....	×	×
Wellsboro (Tioga County).....	×	×
PUERTO RICO		
Aguadilla (Aguada and Aguadilla Municipalities).....	×	×
Arecibo (Arecibo, Camuy, and Hatillo Municipalities).....	×	×
Caguas (Agua Buenas, Caguas, Cidra, Gurabo, Juncos, and San Lorenzo Municipalities)*.....	×	×
Carolina (Carolina and Loiza Municipalities).....	×	×
Cayey (Aibonito and Cayey Municipalities).....	×	×
Corozal (Corozal Municipality).....	×	×
Dorado (Dorado Municipality).....	×	×
Fajardo (Caiba, Fajardo, and Luquillo Municipalities).....	×	×
Guayama (Arroyo, Guayama, and Pitillas Municipalities).....	×	×
Humacao (Humacao, Las Piedras, and Yabucoa Municipalities).....	×	×
Juana Diaz (Coamo, Juana-Diaz, Santa Isabel, and Villaba Municipalities).....	×	×
Manati (Barceloneta, Ciales, Manati, and Morovis Municipalities).....	×	×
Maunabo (Maunabo Municipality).....	×	×
Mayaguez (Mayaguez Municipality).....	×	×
Naguabo (Naguabo Municipality).....	×	×
Ponce (Ponce Municipality)*.....	×	×
Quebradillas (Quebradillas Municipality).....	×	×
Salinas (Salinas Municipality).....	×	×

Labor area <sup>1</sup> (Political Subdivisions included)	Substantial	Persistent	Labor area <sup>1</sup> (Political Subdivisions included)	Substantial	Persistent	Labor area <sup>1</sup> (Political Subdivisions included)	Substantial	Persistent
San German (Cabo Rojo, Hormigueros, Lajas, Sabana Grande, and San German Municipalities).....		X	Panguitch (Garfield County).....		X	Romney (Hampshire County).....		X
Toa Alta (Toa Alta Municipality).....	X		Park City (Summit County).....		X	Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs (Greenbrier and Monroe Counties).....		X
Toa Baja (Toa Baja Municipality).....	X		Price (Carbon and Emery Counties).....		X	Sistersville (Tyler County).....	X	
Trujillo Alto (Trujillo Alto Municipality).....	X		Provo-Orem (Utah County)*.....	X		Spencer (Roane County).....		X
Vega Alta (Vega Alta Municipality).....	X		Richfield (Sevier County).....		X	Wayne County.....		X
Vega Baja (Vega Baja Municipality).....	X		Roosevelt (Duchesne County).....		X	Webster Springs (Webster County).....		X
Yauco (Guanica, Guayanilla, and Yauco Municipalities).....		X	St. George (Washington County).....		X	Welch (McDowell County).....		X
RHODE ISLAND			VERMONT			WISCONSIN		
Providence-Pawtucket (Bristol, Kent, and Providence Counties, R.I.; town of Jamestown in Newport County, R.I.; Washington County, R.I., except towns of Charlestown, Hopkinton, and Westerly; city of Attleboro, towns of North Attleboro, Rehoboth, and Seekonk in Bristol County, Mass.; towns of Be lingham, Franklin, Plainville, and Wrentham in Norfolk County, Mass.; towns of Blackstone and Millville in Worcester County, Mass.) (See Massachusetts-Fall River)*.....		X	Bennington (Bennington County).....	X		Adams (Adams County).....		X
SOUTH CAROLINA			St. Albans (Franklin County plus north half of Grand Isle County including towns of Alburg, Isle La Motte, and North Hero).....	X		Antigo (Langlade County).....	X	
Barnwell (Barnwell County).....		X	Springfield (Towns of Athens, Grafton, Londonderry, Rockingham, Westminster, and Windham in Windham County; Towns of Andover, Baltimore, Cavendish, Chester, Ludlow, Reading, Springfield, Weathersfield, Weston, West Windsor, and Windsor in Windsor County).....	X		Arcadia (Trempealeau County).....	X	
Bennettsville (Marlboro County).....	X		VIRGINIA			Ashland (Ashland County).....	X	
Berkeley County.....	X		Bristol (Washington County, Va.; Independent City of Bristol, Va.; Division of Avoca, Blountville, Bluff City, Bristol, Holston Valley, Piney Flats, and Weaver in Sullivan County, Tenn.), Va.-Tenn.....	X		Bayfield (Bayfield County).....		X
Bishopville (Lee County).....	X		Chincocheague (Accomack and Northampton Counties).....		X	Beloit-Janesville (Rock County).....	X	
Cheraw (Chesterfield County).....	X		Colonial Beach (Lancaster, Northumberland, Richmond, and Westmoreland Counties).....		X	Black River Falls (Jackson County).....		X
Georgetown (Georgetown County).....	X		Grundy (Buchanan County).....		X	Crandon (Forest County).....		X
Marion (Marion County).....	X		Lebanon (Dickenson and Russell Counties).....		X	Darlington (Lafayette County).....	X	
McCormick (McCormick County).....	X		Norton-Big Stone Gap (Wise County; Independent City of Norton).....		X	Dodgeville (Iowa County).....	X	
Orangeburg (Orangeburg County).....	X		Richlands (Tazewell County).....		X	Douglas County.....		X
Saluda (Saluda County).....	X		WASHINGTON			Eagle River (Vilas County).....	X	
Union (Union County).....	X		Aberdeen (Grays Harbor County).....		X	Florence (Florence County).....		X
Winesboro (Fairfield County).....	X		Anacortes (Skagit County?).....		X	Grantsburg (Burnett County).....		X
TENNESSEE			Bremerton (Kitsap County).....	X		Green Bay (Brown County)*.....	X	
Centerville (Hickman County).....	X		Centrali (Lewis County).....	X		Hayward (Sawyer County).....		X
Dayton (Rhea County).....	X		Colville (Stevens County).....	X		Hurley (Iron County).....		X
Decatur (Meigs County).....	X		Dayton (Columbia County).....	X		Kewaunee (Kewaunee County).....	X	
Dunlap (Sequatchie County).....	X		Ellensburg (Kittitas County).....	X		La Crosse (La Crosse County)*.....	X	
Erin (Houston County).....	X		Goldendale (Klickitat County).....	X		Ladysmith (Rusk County).....		X
Greenville (Greene County).....	X		Moses Lake (Grant County).....	X		Mauston (Juneau County).....	X	
Hardin County.....	X		Newport (Pend Oreille County).....	X		Medford (Taylor County).....		X
LaFollete-Jellico (Campbell County).....	X		Okanogan (Okanogan County).....	X		Merrill (Lincoln County).....	X	
Lawrenceburg (Lawrence County).....	X		Olympi (Thurston County).....	X		Neilsville (Clark County).....	X	
Maynardville (Union County).....	X		Port Angeles (Clallam County).....	X		Neopit (Menominee County).....		X
Morgan County.....	X		Port Townsend (Jefferson County).....	X		Oconto (Oconto County).....	X	
Newport (Cocke County).....	X		Raymond (Pacific County).....	X		Park Falls (Price County).....	X	
Oneida (Scott County).....	X		Republic (Ferry County).....	X		Prairie du Chien (Crawford County).....	X	
Rutledge (Grainger County).....	X		Seattle (King and Snohomish Counties)*.....	X		Racine (Racine County)*.....	X	
Sevierville (Sevier County).....	X		Spokane (Spokane County)*.....	X		Shawano (Shawano County).....	X	
Sparta (White County).....	X		Stevenson (Skamania County).....	X		Sparta (Monroe County).....	X	
Sweetwater (Monroe County) (See also Virginia-Bristol).....	X		Tacoma (Pierce County).....	X		Spooner (Washburn County).....	X	
TEXAS			Tri-City (Benton and Franklin Counties).....	X		Sturgeon Bay (Door County).....	X	
Atlanta (Cass County).....	X		Wenatchee (Chelan and Douglas Counties).....	X		Viroqua (Vernon County).....		X
Brackettville (Kinney County).....	X		Yakima (Yakim County) (See also Oregon-Portland).....	X		Waupaca (Waupaca County).....	X	
Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito (Cameron County)*.....	X		WEST VIRGINIA			Wausau (Marathon County).....	X	
Carrizo Springs (Dimmit County).....	X		Beckley (Raleigh County).....	X		Wautona (Waushara County).....	X	
Cotulla (La Salle County).....	X		Berkeley Springs (Morgan County).....	X		LEAVE OF ABSENCE		
Crystal City (Zavala County).....	X		Bluefield (Mercer County).....	X		By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:		
Del Rio (Val Verde County).....	X		Charleston (Kanawha County)*.....	X		Mr. KEMP (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), after 3:30 pm. today, on account of official business.		
Eagle Pass (Maverick County).....	X		Clarksburg (Doddridge and Harrison Counties).....	X		Mr. BARING (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today through Thursday, May 27, on account of official business.		
Floresville (Wilson County).....	X		Clay (Clay County).....	X		Mr. FOLEY (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for the week of May 17, on account of official business.		
Hebbronville (Jim Hogg County).....	X		Elkins (Randolph County).....	X		Mr. RUPPE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through June 4, on account of official business.		
Hondo (Medina County).....	X		Franklin (Pendleton County).....	X		Mr. CORMAN, for Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, May 18, 19, and 20, on account of official business.		
Laredo (Webb County)*.....	X		Gassaway (Braxton County).....	X		SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED		
McAllen (Hidalgo County)*.....	X		Glenville (Gilmer County).....	X		By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:		
Newton (Newton County).....	X		Grafton (Taylor County).....	X		(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MIZELL) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extra-neous matter:)		
Pearsall (Frio County).....	X		Grantsville (Calhoun County).....	X				
Pleasanton (Atascosa County).....	X		Hamlin (Lincoln County).....	X				
Raymondville (Willacy County).....	X		Huntington-Ashland (Cabell and Wayne Counties, W. Va.; Boyd County, Ky.; Lawrence County, Ohio)*.....	X				
Rio Grande City (Starr County).....	X		Hinton (Summers County).....	X				
San Augustine (San Augustine County).....	X		Kingwood (Preston County).....	X				
Texarkana (Bowie County, Texas; Miller County, Ark.)*.....	X		Logan-Madison (Boone and Logan Counties).....	X				
Uvalde (Uvalde County).....	X		Marlinton (Pocahontas County).....	X				
Zapata (Zapata County).....	X		Martinsburg (Berkeley and Jefferson Counties).....	X				
UTAH			Mineral County.....	X				
Beaver (Beaver County).....	X		Moorefield (Hardy County).....	X				
Brigham City (Box Elder County).....	X		New Martinsville (Wetzel County).....	X				
Heber City (Wasatch County).....	X		Oak Hill-Montgomery (Fayette County).....	X				
Kanab (Kane County).....	X		Parkersburg (Wirt and Wood Counties).....	X				
Manti (Sanpete County).....	X		Parsons (Tucker County).....	X				
Moab (Grand and San Juan Counties).....	X		Pennsboro (Ritchie County).....	X				
Nephi (Juab County).....	X		Petersburg (Grant County).....	X				
Ogden (precincts of Clearfield, Clinton, Kaysville, Layton, South Weber, Syracuse, and West Point in Davis County; Weber County)*.....	X		Point Pleasant (Mason County).....	X				
			Richwood (Nicholas County).....	X				

<sup>1</sup> Major labor areas and other areas which are standard metropolitan statistical areas are shown with an asterisk.  
<sup>2</sup> Program eligibility extends only to corporate limits of the municipality, not to other portions of the labor area containing the city.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOSMER, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. McCLOSKEY, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HOGAN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PRICE of Texas, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Boggs) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RARICK, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. PICKLE, for 60 minutes, on June 7.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, for 20 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. RONCALIO), to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HAMILTON, for 10 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MADDEN, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. McCLURE to follow the remarks of Mr. ASPINALL on the introduction of the lead-zinc bill.

Mr. MAHON, to revise and extend his remarks on the conference report, and to include tables and extraneous matter.

All Members (at the request of Mr. RONCALIO) to have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on Mr. FASCELL's special order on Cuban Independence, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MIZELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. ROBISON of New York.

Mr. SCHWENGL.

Mr. McCLOSKEY.

Mr. GUDE in three instances.

Mr. MOSHER.

Mr. REID of New York.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. RIEGLE.

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in six instances.

Mr. McCLORY in two instances.

Mr. SCHERLE in 10 instances.

Mr. CAMP in two instances.

Mr. DU PONT.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. BRAY in two instances.

Mr. FREY.

Mr. SCHMITZ in four instances.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.

Mrs. DWYER in five instances.

Mr. HUTCHINSON.

Mr. ZION.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. WHITEHURST in three instances.

Mr. RHODES in five instances.

Mr. LUJAN in two instances.

Mr. HILLIS.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. BAKER.

Mr. MIZELL in three instances.

Mr. GOLDWATER in two instances.

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mr. QUIE.

Mr. O'KONSKI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Boggs) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BRADEMAS.

Mr. O'HARA.

Mr. STOKES.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

Mr. ASHLEY.

Mr. MOORHEAD.

Mr. KOCH.

Mr. MIKVA.

Mr. ROSENTHAL.

Mr. BINGHAM.

Mrs. CHISHOLM.

Mr. REUSS.

Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. REES.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts.

Mr. SEIBERLING in 10 instances.

Mr. ABBITT in two instances.

Mr. HUNGATE in three instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Mr. MANN in 10 instances.

Mr. GARMATZ in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. O'NEILL in two instances.

Mrs. ABZUG in two instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in four instances.

Mr. PEPPER in two instances.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. TIERNAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RONCALIO) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HATHAWAY.

Mr. BOLLING in three instances.

Mr. DOW in two instances.

Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. HAMILTON in two instances.

Mr. ROONEY of New York.

Mr. JACOBS in two instances.

Mr. PURCELL in two instances.

Mr. LEGGETT.

Mr. SCHEUER in two instances.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mr. TAYLOR in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California.

Mr. MAHON in two instances.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5352. A bill to amend the act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1971 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce.

H.R. 7500. A bill to provide for the placement of Lt. Gen. Keith B. McCutcheon, U.S.

Marine Corps, when retired, on the retired list in the grade of general.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 24, 1971, 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:

738. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting amendments to the request for appropriations for fiscal year 1972 for the Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 92-114); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

739. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

740. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the establishment of an American Council for Private International Communications, Incorporated, to grant support to the activities of private American organizations engaged in the field of communication with foreign peoples; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

741. A letter from the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise the procedural and administrative provisions of District of Columbia taxing laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

742. A letter from the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the government of the District of Columbia to engage in certain activities designed to effect community development; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

743. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting copies of Presidential determination No. 71-13, concerning defense articles and services, pursuant to section 614(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

744. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed contract for a research project entitled "Process and Engineering Design of Coal and Gas Prototype Pilot Plant," pursuant to Public Law 89-672; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

745. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed concession contract for the continued provision of food, beverage, and merchandising facilities and services for the public within Mount Rushmore National Memorial, S. Dak., for the 20-year period ending February 28, 1991, pursuant to 67 Stat. 271 and 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

746. A letter from the legislative counsel, Department of the Interior, transmitting the environmental impact statement to accompany the proposed bill to provide for the

cooperation between the Federal Government and the States with respect to environmental regulations for mining operations, and for other purposes, pursuant to section 102(2) (C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

747. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report of the final determination of the Commission in docket No. 346, Horace G. Ridaught, et cetera, on behalf of the *Ridaught Band of Indians, Plaintiff, v. The United States of America, defendant*, pursuant to 60 Stat. 1049, 1055; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

748. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 31, 1971, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on Calumet Harbor and River, Illinois and Indiana, in response to section 304 of the River and Harbor Act, approved October 27, 1965, and requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, adopted November 9, 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

749. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 9, 1971, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Great and Little Bays and their tributaries and adjoining tributaries of the Piscataqua River, New Hampshire and Maine, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 24, 1965. It is also in response to section 304 of the River and Harbor Act, approved October 27, 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

750. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 9, 1971, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on Aguadilla Harbor, Puerto Rico, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted February 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

751. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 29, 1971, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on Sakonnet Harbor, Little Compton, R.I., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted January 29, 1965, and June 24, 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

752. A letter from the Administrator of General Services, transmitting a prospectus revising the authorized U.S. Tax Court Building in Washington, D.C., pursuant to 73 Stat. 480; to the Committee on Public Works.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

753. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting an assessment of the Teacher Corps program at Western Carolina University and participating schools in North Carolina, as administered by the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 6217. A bill to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with amendment (Rept. No. 92-220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAHON: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 8190; (Rept. No. 92-221). And ordered to be printed.

Mr. HOLIFIELD: Committee on Government Operations. House Resolution 411. Resolution to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1, of 1971; (Rept. No. 92-222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL (for himself and Mr. McCLURE):

H.R. 8587. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 8588. A bill to restore the investment tax credit and to liberalize the credit available for used machine tools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (for himself, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. BLANTON, and Mr. GUDE):

H.R. 8589. A bill to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, to revise the composition of the Commission on Licensure to Practice the Healing Art, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H.R. 8590. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs, produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself and Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts):

H.R. 8591. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for its uniform application to all of the navigable waters of the United States and to provide financial assistance to States and municipalities for water quality enhancement and pollution control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 8592. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 8593. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to provide that the products of State inspected facilities after meeting the inspection requirements shall be eligible for distribution in establishments on the same basis as plants inspected under title I; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HULL, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MYERS, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. TRONE, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 8594. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, section 204; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FORSYTHE (for himself, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mr. HELSTOSKI):

H.R. 8595. A bill to limit the authority of States to impose income taxes on residents of other States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 8596. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to strengthen the student insured loan program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GRASSO (for herself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BURTON, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FAUNTRY, Mr. HALPREN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MCKINNEY, and Mr. COTTER):

H.R. 8597. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Sickle Cell Anemia Institute; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. GRASSO (for herself, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. STEELE, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 8598. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Sickle Cell Anemia Institute; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. BELL, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SEBERLING):

H.R. 8599. A bill to encourage and help implement improvements in the judicial machinery of our State and local courts by creating an Institute for Judicial Studies and Assistance, the purpose of which shall be to make grants to State and local courts and nonprofit organizations to carry out the objectives of the act and to serve as a reservoir of up-to-date information on court management and organization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 8600. A bill to name the new Federal Bureau of Investigation Building the J. Edgar Hoover Building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8601. A bill to grant the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to place fill material in the Alleghany River, a navigable water of the United States, in connection with the construction of the Warren By-Pass Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. FRENZEL, and Mr. RUPPE):

H.R. 8602. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that individuals be apprised of records concerning them which

are maintained by Government agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. WARE):

H.R. 8603. A bill for the relief of Soviet Jews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MELCHER:

H.R. 8604. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to apply with respect to veterans and war orphans in noncollege level educational institutions the same criteria for determining satisfactory pursuance of course work that is applied with respect to veterans and war orphans in college level educational institutions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 8605. A bill to prohibit commercial flights by aircraft at supersonic speeds within the United States until the Congress approves findings by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency that such flights will not have detrimental physiological effects on persons on the ground and will not have detrimental effects on the environment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 8606. A bill to establish certain qualifications for election to the offices of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 8607. A bill for the relief of certain separated former employees of railroad terminal companies who formerly performed certain discontinued mail handling functions in and about railroad terminals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 8608. A bill to amend title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to authorize financial assistance for the provision of street lighting facilities in aid of the prevention or reduction of crime; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 8609. A bill to improve and increase postsecondary education opportunities throughout the Nation by providing assistance to the States for the development and construction of comprehensive community colleges; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 8610. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the establishment of a National Drug Testing and Evaluation Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8611. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 in order to promote competition among motor vehicle manufacturers in the design and production of safe motor vehicles having greater resistance to damage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8612. A bill to amend the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 to provide grants for costs of initiating services in community mental retardation facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 8613. A bill to provide authority for the payment of proficiency pay to enlisted members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 8614. A bill to amend titles 10 and 32, United States Code, to authorize additional medical and dental care and other related benefits for reservists and members of the National Guard, under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 8615. A bill to provide for the crediting of certain past employment by certain persons subject to the National Guard Technicians Act of 1968; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 8616. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to provide that Army and Air Force National Guard technicians shall not be required to wear the military uniform while performing their duties in a civilian status; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 8617. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to \$750 in all cases the amount of the lump-sum death payment thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 8618. A bill to provide for small farm participation in the feed grain program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 8619. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for expenses incurred in providing education and training for mentally retarded or physically handicapped children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. KOCH, Mr. YATES, Mr. RYAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PATTEN, and Mr. MINISH):

H.R. 8620. A bill to prohibit commercial flights by supersonic aircraft into or over the United States until certain findings are made by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and by the Secretary of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 8621. A bill to provide comprehensive drug addiction treatment for members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 8622. A bill to make it a Federal crime to travel in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution for the killing of a policeman or fireman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 8623. A bill to authorize the United States to transfer the nuclear vessel N.S. Savannah to the city of Savannah, Ga., for the purpose of preserving and establishing such vessel in its home port for all generations, as a monument to the peaceful uses of atomic energy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 8624. A bill to confirm full title to Winter Island in the city of Salem in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 8625. A bill relating to lands in the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.R. 8626. A bill to designate certain lands as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts:

H.R. 8627. A bill to revise the provisions of

the Communications Act of 1934 which relate to political broadcasting; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8628. A bill to revise the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934 which relate to political broadcasting; to limit expenditures for use of communications media in campaigns for Federal elective office; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 8629. A bill to amend title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to provide increased manpower for the health professions and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8630. A bill to amend title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to provide for training increased numbers of nurses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 8631. A bill to prohibit open cut construction on historic properties throughout the Nation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHOUP:

H.R. 8632. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 8633. A bill to provide for the construction and improvement of a certain road on the Navajo Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS (for himself, Mr. GETTYS, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 8634. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H.R. 8635. A bill to encourage improvement in pollution control standards and conditions, to provide a system of mutual loan insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 8636. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to revise the eligibility conditions for annuities, to change the railroad retirement tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8637. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 8638. A bill to establish a National Institute of Advertising, Marketing, and Society; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 8639. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, to provide assistance for the development of nonlethal weapons and police protection equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 8640. A bill to amend chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code, to establish a survivor benefit plan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 8641. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restore the provisions permitting the deduction, without regard to the 3-percent and 1-percent floors,

of medical expenses incurred for the care of individuals 65 years of age and over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. LENT, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. REES, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VEYSEY, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 8642. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to provide for more effective control of aircraft noise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURLESON of Texas:

H.R. 8643. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit, in certain instances, the State health agency of a State to waive certain requirements relating to health and safety which must be met by hospitals in such State in order for them to participate in the insurance program established by such title, and to amend title XIX of such act to eliminate the Life Safety Code of the National Fire Protection Association as the official standard for determining whether nursing homes meet health and safety standards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 8644. A bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of the one thousandth anniversary of the birth of Saint Stephen of Hungary; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BADILLO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MANN, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 8645. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit certain tax exempt organizations to engage in communications with legislative bodies, and committees and members thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAPPELL (for himself, Mr. SIKES, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, and Mr. WAGGONNER):

H.J. Res. 652. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to freedom of choice in attending public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAPPELL (for himself, Mr. SIKES, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, and Mr. WAGGONNER):

H.J. Res. 653. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to freedom of choice in attending public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.J. Res. 654. Joint resolution concerning a commemorative postage stamp honoring the U.S. pork industry; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H.J. Res. 655. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the reconfirmation of Justices of the Supreme Court every 12 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.J. Res. 656. Joint resolution providing for the designation of the first week of February of each year as National Youth Appreciation Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.J. Res. 657. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an Annual Youth Appreciation Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia (for himself and Mr. BLANTON):

H.J. Res. 658. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to freedom from forced assignment to schools or jobs because of race, creed, or color; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.J. Res. 659. Joint resolution to protect U.S. fishermen, their vessels and gear from unlawful harassment on the high seas adjacent to the territorial sea of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, and Mr. PURCELL):

H.J. Res. 660. Joint resolution to instruct the President of the United States to release certain appropriated funds; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mrs.

ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. CELLER, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mrs. GRASSO):

H. Con. Res. 312. Concurrent resolution authorizing the placing of a bust or statue of Martin Luther King, Jr., in the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mr.

HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NIX, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, Mr. REUSS, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. RODINO):

H. Con. Res. 313. Concurrent resolution authorizing the placing of a bust or statue of Martin Luther King, Jr., in the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mr.

ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. YATES):

H. Con. Res. 314. Concurrent resolution authorizing the placing of a bust or statue of Martin Luther King, Jr., in the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H. Con. Res. 315. Concurrent resolution relating to the 1971 South Vietnamese elections; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. Res. 449. Resolution creating additional positions on the U.S. Capitol Police force for duty under the House of Representatives and providing a system of overtime pay for

the U.S. Capitol Police under the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROUSSELOT (for himself and Mr. DANIELSON):

H. Res. 450. Resolution congratulating San Gabriel, Calif., and her residents on the occasion of her two hundredth anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Res. 451. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

180. By Mr. LENT: Memorial of the Senate of the State of New York, resolving that the Congress of the United States be and hereby is memorialized to take all necessary steps to persuade the Government of Turkey to immediately destroy its opium poppy fields before the 1971 harvest in return for reimbursement to its opium farmers of the damages suffered thereby from funds appropriated for that purpose by the State of New York and the U.S. Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

181. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to the treatment of prisoners of war in North Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

182. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age and older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

183. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, relative to the establishment of a national cemetery in Vigo County, Ind.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.R. 8646. A bill for the relief of Nestor Maghirang Dalusong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 8647. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Bunomo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 8648. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Lavorato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKINNEY:

H.R. 8649. A bill for the relief of Bjorn Hellmut Merker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHMITZ:

H.R. 8650. A bill for the relief of Xuan Tien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 8651. A bill for the relief of Rosa Lee Wallace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, 78. The SPEAKER presented petition of the city council, San Luis Obispo, Calif., relative to Federal-State revenue sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.