United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, June 10, 1971*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

He that dwelleth in the secret place of the most high shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty.—Psalm 91: 1.

Draw near to us, our Father, as we in our prayer endeavor to draw near to Thee. Take away from our hearts all petty desires and remove far from us all selfish endeavors that in deed and in truth we may dwell in the secret place of the Most High and ever abide under the shadow of the Almighty.

Make us clean in mind, wholesome in spirit, firm in faith, strong to do the right as we see what is right for us to do and ready to serve Thee and our country with all our might.

Thus may we be worthy of the position we hold and eager to lead our people in the paths of peace. To the glory of Thy holy name. 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 without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1444. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Snohomish Tribe in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 125, the Upper Skagit Tribe in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 92, and the Snoqualmie and Skykomish Tribes in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 93, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 4353. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma and of Kansas and Nebraska in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 79–A, 153, 158, 209, and 231, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6072. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Pembina Band of Chippewa Indians in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 18–A, 113, and 191, and for other purposes.

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

S. 557. An act to amend the Wagner-O'Day Act to extend the provisions thereof to other severely handicapped individuals who are not blind, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 31) entitled "An act to provide during times of high unemployment for programs of public service employment for unemployed persons, to assist States and local communities in providing needed public services, and for other purposes," agreed to conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. NELSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. STEVENSON, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. DOMINICK, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 101. An act to provide for the disposition of a portion of the funds to pay a judgment in favor of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of Indians of Fort Hall, Idaho; the Shoshone Tribe of Indians of the Wind River Reservation, Wyoming; the Bannock Tribe and the Shoshone Nation or Tribe of Indians in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 326–D, 326–E, 326–F, 326–G, 326–H, 366, and 367, consolidated, and for other purposes; and

S. 1462. An act to provide for the distribution to the Sisseton and Wahpeton Tribes of Sioux Indians of their portion of the funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Mississippi Sioux Indians in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 142 and 359, and for other purposes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 7, I was absent from the House due to business in my district on behalf of my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

On rollcall 120, the vote to suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 8011, to amend the Wagner-O'Day Act, I would have voted "yea." I am pleased that this bill passed by a vote of 309 to 0.

On rollcall 121, the vote to suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 1161, to permit the American domestic wine industry to display and promote its products overseas, I would have voted "yea." I am pleased that this bill passed by a vote of 298 to 13.

On rollcall 122, the vote on the bill H.R. 7960, to authorize appropriations for the National Science Foundation, I would have voted "yea." I am pleased that this bill passed by a vote of 319 to 8.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 120 I was unavoidably detained on official business in New York. Had I been present I would have voted for passage of the bill.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1971

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 471 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 471

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8866) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against section 7 of said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Agriculture, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 128]

Anderson, Tenn.	Dingell	McEwen
Ashley	Edwards, Ala.	Mailliard
Badillo	Edwards, La.	Passman
Baring	Evins, Tenn.	Pepper
Barrett	Flowers	Peyser
Biaggi	Frey	Railsback
Blatnik	Gallagher	Rees
Bolling	Gettys	Rooney, Pa.
Brown, Mich.	Gibbons	Runnels
Brown, Ohio	Gray	Scheuer
Byrnes, Wis.	Griffiths	Slack
Carney	Grover	Springer
Celler	Gude	Stafford
Chappell	Halpern	Stephens
Chisholm	Hansen, Idaho	Symington
Clark	Hays	Talcott
Clausen, Don H.	Hébert	Teague, Tex.
Clay	Heckler, Mass.	Thompson, N.J.
Collier	Hosmer	Tiernan
Conyers	Jarman	Veysey
Cotter	King	Ware
Coughlin	Kluczynski	Watts
Culver	Landrum	Wydler
Denholm	Leggett	Zablocki
Dent	Lent	
	McCormack	
	McCulloch	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 357 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1971

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 471 provides a closed rule with 3 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 8866, Sugar Act Amendments of 1971. All points of order are waived against section 7 of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4 of rule XXI, because it is an appropriation in a legislative bill.

The purpose of H.R. 8866 is to extend the Sugar Act, with some modifications, to December 31, 1974.

The bill would extend the act for 3 years. This program, first established in 1934, is intended to maintain a competitive domestic sugar industry to produce a substantial portion of our sugar requirements; to assure to U.S. consumers a plentiful supply of sugar at reasonable prices; to permit friendly foreign governments to participate equitably in supplying the U.S. sugar market for the dual purpose of encouraging exports of U.S. commodities and assuring ourselves of dependable supplies of sugar.

This program has worked well for a number of years. It is serving the American public. It has given an adequate supply of sugar and has helped a number of foreign countries.

This is one of the few continuing programs we have which does not cost the taxpayers any money.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 471 in order that H.R. 8866 may be considered.

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

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey for a question.

Mr. HOWARD. My question is that the Sugar Act here is being extended, with some modifications.

Mr. DELANEY. That is right.

Mr. HOWARD. Presumably, some modifications were made by the committee that wrote the bill. However, other Members of the House may desire to provide some modifications to this Sugar Act extension in relation to South Africa.

Could the gentleman tell me why the Rules Committee accepted the fact that only the modifications that came out of the committee that brought the bill to the floor are permitted and that other Members of Congress will not be permitted to attempt to offer amendments to further modify the extension of the act?

Mr. DELANEY. If we opened up this bill to amendment it would be a hodgepodge. This system has worked well, fairly well, over a number of years. It is anticipated now that we have to prepare for the next 3 years. If we do not make agreements at the present time for future shipments of sugar, we just will not have any in the years to come.

So, we are extending this for a period of 4 years. There is no way to apportion this with exact justice. The Committee on Agriculture has held long hearings and everyone had an opportunity to testify before the committee. In their judgment they did as good a job as they possibly could under all of the circumstances.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I understand the gentleman is not speaking for the whole Rules Committee but is it the feeling of the Rules Committee that the rest of the Members of this House cannot be trusted to offer amendments designed to improve the bill but which would make a hodgepodge of it?

Mr. DELANEY. I decline to yield further to the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

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

Mr. DIGGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion or close of the debate on the rule there will be a motion to vote down the previous question offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Dow), a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

The purpose of that motion would be to allow a limited rule specifically aimed at eliminating the quota contained in this bill for the continuation of the sugar subsidy for South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, when this matter was pending before the Rules Committee yesterday the question was raised as to whether or not the House should have an opportunity to get at this one specific issue, to determine whether we are going to continue this subsidy to a developed country, contrary to all of our criteria worth some $5 million which does not sift down to the majority black population in that country and which has very serious implications in terms of U.S. foreign policy in the U.N. and elsewhere about which I have considerable knowledge as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Africa, whether or not we should limit our own domestic production for the benefit of a developed nation such as South Africa or whether or not we should do damage to our image not only in the U.N. but in other forums around the world where we are trying to implement pronouncements that we have made about helping the underdeveloped nations of the world.

So, there will be a motion made to vote down the previous question in order that we can get at this one issue. That motion will be offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Dow).

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it perfectly clear that it will only be aimed at South Africa. It will not disturb the rest of the bill, because I agree if we opened it up completely without this kind of limitation there could be some dire consequences.

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

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

Mr. DOW. I know that the distinguished chairman of the Africa Subcommittee has recently made one of several trips to Africa. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not correct in his travels through Africa and the sub-Sahara countries generally that there is a feeling that the United States criticizes South Africa in words but we do not back up our words with any deeds. Is that not the fact?

Mr. DIGGS. The gentleman is eminently correct. I have been in over 37 African countries, and the first question that is always asked at a press conference is when are we going to implement our pronouncements in the United Nations, and stop being inconsistent, by providing this kind of subsidy to South Africa, which is one of the most racist countries in the world.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, as far as the gentleman knows has the House of Representatives previously had an opportunity to vote in such a way as to show what it thinks about the apartheid system in South Africa?

Mr. DIGGS. No. This is the first time that this matter has come up. I think it emphasizes its importance. It may account for the fact that there was an eight-to-six vote in the Committee on Rules to provide a limited rule on this specific issue; that when there was a vote to open it up all the way there was only one vote for that, but when it was specifically limited to the South African question it was a vote of six to eight.

Mr. BINGHAM. The gentleman from Michigan I believe has himself suffered some of the evils of the apartheid system, if I am not mistaken. I wonder if the gentleman would care to comment upon the treatment of American citizens in South Africa?

Mr. DIGGS. It is interesting to note,

in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from New York, that in the preamble to the Foreign Assistance Act it specifies that this kind of assistance should not be given to nations who discriminate against American citizens. I have been refused twice a visa to that country. We also have ample evidence of many other cases of discrimination against American citizens in that country.

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members of the House will be entirely clear on the procedure that we are engaged in today. Many of us believe that this House should have an opportunity to vote on whether the United States should continue to subsidize apartheid in South Africa. Therefore, we believe the motion for the previous question should be voted down so the House can have an opportunity to amend the closed rule only in this one respect.

Now, there are many of us who are opposed to closed rules in principle, and I am one of those. I would like to see this whole rule opened up. But because we feel this one issue is so important, we have agreed to concentrate on giving this House an opportunity to vote to stop the sugar subsidy to South Africa.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the subsidy is not to the South African Government. There is undisputed testimony that the growers put all their sugar in one combine, and the money goes to that combine. The nation itself really does not get the allocation of this money.

There are 4,398 black growers, 2,194 white growers, and 1,877 Indian growers. They all get their proportionate share. The South African Government does not receive 1 penny. It all goes to the growers of the sugar who are in the combine.

Mr. BINGHAM. If I may continue—and I respect the views of the distinguished gentleman from New York—I would say that I think this is a fine distinction that 20 million Americans who have dark skins are not going to understand. As far as they are concerned, this is a subsidy to South Africa.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I oppose in its present form the resolution to consider the Sugar Act of 1971, because the resolution represents a closed rule.

A closed rule is not the preferred way to forge any legislation, for it is a denial and negation of legislative action. This criticism is all the more valid when this closed rule forecloses debate on one of the most highly suspect bills that this body will entertain over a long period of time.

Consider the general aspect of the sugar industry. Consider the consortium of sugar producers, sugar processors, large sugar buyers, and the great candy and bottling companies. Consider, too, the 34 foreign nations battling for quotas which are allotted by the United States as favors. Now these several sugar interests, particularly the domestic ones, have formed a tidy grouping which divides up the sugar plum pie, worth at least $1½ billion, by agreements among themselves.

These agreements were mentioned time and again in the deliberations of the Agriculture Committee as the basis for proceeding amicably with the writing of the sugar bill. But hardly anywhere did we in the committee hear from or about the consumer. One consumer witness appeared, and his treatment at the hands of the committee was cavalier. That is the best I can say for it, and the record will bear me out.

So the consortium has its bill which divvies up the sugar plum pie. And the operation is festooned, too, with lobbyists. Read the list, and the compensation they received, which appeared in the Congressional Quarterly on May 21 of this year at page 1133.

Considering this picture of richness shared among friends, do you want to be foreclosed from legislating the issues involved? Do you want to go home to your constituents and say, "They did it the way they wanted, and we did not have a chance to do anything about it"?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have three amendments I would like to offer, which barely touch the fringes of the central problem. But at least they deal with some of the obvious shortcomings in the Sugar Act of 1971. Yet this resolution containing a closed rule slams the door on my few amendments, and others that I know the Members will want to offer.

In the parliamentary situation as it is now, where we are confronted by a closed rule, adopted by a vote of 8 to 6 in the Rules Committee, I will jettison two of my amendments, in order to salvage one. I will vote against the previous question, and I hope it will be voted down, with the sole purpose of securing passage of only one amendment to the sugar bill. Let us concentrate on this.

It will be an amendment to strike from the bill the sugar quota for South Africa, and to allocate that quota, consisting of 60,003 short tons, worth $5 million, proportionately as the bill provides to the remaining 33 nations.

Now the established and formalized criteria for granting sugar quotas take cognizance of the "present stage of and need for economic development" in the beneficiary nation. South Africa is rated as a "developed" nation by the standard set by the Agency for International Development. More importantly, it is known that the Government of South Africa practices an abominable apartheid racial policy. "We want to keep South Africa white," said Prime Minister Verwoerd in 1963, speaking in a land that is five-sixths black. And that government is doing just what he said. The South African Terrorism Act of 1937, according to a United Nations report, contains "probably the broadest definition of a crime ever created by any statute." The Group Areas Act classifies people by skin color and denies them rights and privileges accordingly. In South Africa we have brutish subjugation of one race by another, which is an affront to every free man everywhere.

I do not recommend that the United States discontinue relations with South Africa or cease to trade with that country. And I do not favor a policy of retaliation against them because of the numerous documented cases of exclusion practiced against black American citizens and U.S. Congressmen.

I recommend an amendment to the Sugar Act to strike the South African sugar quota because that quota is a bonanza and a mark of our special favor which is not warranted, considering South African racial discriminations. I do not believe that we should bestow regards upon a nation that blatantly offends transcendent principles of human relations.

In order to secure passage of my one amendment to the sugar bill, Mr. Speaker, I will not ask that the closed rule be overridden wholly, but only that the rule in the resolution before us be amended to assign a zero sugar quota to South Africa. In order to accomplish this one purpose, I ask all of you of like mind, to vote down the previous question on the resolution, so that my amendment can be offered.

Let me ask, What do you owe to South Africa that you must uphold that government and its practices that contradict and insult the principles of equality for which we labor and constantly struggle in our own Nation?

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

Mr. DOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I have two quick questions, one is as to these sugar quotas having to go to underdeveloped countries and the other to countries that are friendly to the United States and its citizens. I would like to ask the first question.

Is South Africa considered an underdeveloped country?

Mr. DOW. No; the Agency for International Development, I will say to the gentleman, classifies South Africa as a developed country.

Mr. HOWARD. So, therefore, it does not qualify under those terms.

And as to the application of American citizens, is there not ample evidence South Africa is much less than friendly to certain American citizens including one or more Members of this body?

Mr. DOW. That is a matter of fact and a matter of record.

I, myself, do not believe in retaliation, but at the same time I do not think we should provide a bonanza to a country with this kind of racial policy.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska, (Mr. MARTIN).

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 471 provides for a closed rule, and 3 hours of debate on H.R. 8866, the Sugar Act Amendments of 1971. It also waives points of order against portions of section 7 because of failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4 of rule XXI of the House.

The Sugar Act, which was first passed by the Congress in 1934 and has been continued since that date, is probably one of the best acts that the Congress of the United States has ever passed. In my

judgment, it is as near perfect a piece of legislation as it is humanly possible to obtain, for the simple reason that it protects the consumer in the purchase of sugar, to assure him a fair price which he will have to pay for sugar; it protects the producer, assuring the producer of a fair return on his investment and an adequate wage for his labor; and it protects the processor and the large industrial purchaser of sugar, in that the price is stabilized and he can plan his operations and his business accordingly. As a consequence, we have a proposal to extend this act for 3 years, until December 31, 1974.

The only points of disagreement in regard to this legislation, at least as we were aware of in our hearings in the Committee on Rules, was in regard to the quotas allocated to various foreign countries. There did not seem to be any disagreement with the purposes of the act, or the domestic side of the act. The fact is that domestic production of sugar accounts for 62 percent of the sugar used in this country. This comes from sugar beets and from cane sugar, with 38 percent coming from 33 foreign countries.

The main disagreements seemed to be which countries should receive these quotas.

The Committee on Agriculture of the House spent several weeks in open hearings on this entire matter. All those within the industry plus the consumers, the foreign governments, and anyone interested—were invited to testify, and they did come and testify over a period of several weeks. Each witness was given ample opportunity to present his views and his ideas to the committee.

After the hearings were completed the committee went into executive session for many, many days. They started in by writing a committee print, and certain sections were immediately agreed upon within the committee. Then they went from that point into other sections which were not in agreement. They discussed them, voted on them, and proceeded to write additional committee prints. This took a matter of several weeks. Every member of the committee was given ample opportunity to speak and to vote on the amendments and the bill itself as it was developed.

Today, we have the fruits of the labor of the Committee on Agriculture to extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

The committee is to be commended, particularly the chairman and the ranking member and all members of the committee, for the excellent piece of legislation which they have before us in the House today.

I would like to point out to the House, Mr. Speaker, the criteria which the committee used in allocating the quotas to the various foreign countries. Again, we did not have any disagreement with this criteria in our hearings nor before the Committee on Rules. There are five points. I would like to read them. They appear on page 5 of the report:

1. Friendly Government to the United States, including nondiscrimination against U.S. citizens in the quota country and indemnification for property owned by U.S. citizens in cases of expropriation.

2. Dependability as a source of sugar supply as reflected by the country's history in supplying the U.S. Market, its maintenance of sugar inventories and its potential for supplying additional sugar upon call during critical periods of short supply.

3. Reciprocal trade as reflected by purchases of U.S. products and services, as contrasted with sales to the U.S., and also by Government treatment of imports from the U.S.

4. Need of the country for a premium priced market in the United States including (a) reference to the extent it shares in other premium priced markets, such as the United Kingdom, (b) its relative dependence on sugar as a source of foreign exchange, and (c) present stage of and need for economic development.

5. Extent to which the benefits of participation in this market are shared by factories and larger land owners with farmers and workers together with other socio-economic policies in the quota countries.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

I believe it is generally agreed that these five points, the criteria for awarding quotas to foreign nations, are fair and equitable.

This committee has had many years of experience in this field. The gentlemen on this committee are knowledgeable. They know what they are doing. They in their judgment, after many weeks of hearings and many hours of discussion in executive session, have come up with a bill which allocates this quota, 38 percent of the total consumption in the United States, to 33 foreign nations.

It is natural there will be some disagreement when we are dealing with as many as 33 nations. That is only human Mr. Speaker, I am willing to trust the judgment of the Committee on Agriculture, because of the knowledge and background the members have in this area.

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

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BELCHER) the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the South African Government is not in the sugar business. There are 4,398 black people in the sugar business, and 2,194 white people in the sugar business. Since 1965, 709 black people have gone into the sugar business and only 50 white people have gone into the sugar business. They have a cooperative over there that belongs to the white people and the black people, too.

Someone said awhile ago that 20 million black people in the United States would not understand why we give a quota of sugar to the South African Government. We did not give it to the South African Government. We gave it to the growers among the South African people.

I do not believe 20 million black people in the United States would want to take away the money from 4,398 black people who live in South Africa. If they want to take care of their own people, why would 20 million people in the United States want to handicap 4,398 black people in South Africa?

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

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

Mr. DOW. I must say I fear the gentleman is clouding the issue by using these terms, "The Government of South Africa," the "people," and "black people" and "white people" of South Africa, in reference to who gets the benefits from this bill. Let me mention the bill itself which does not refer to any of those terms, but refers to "countries." Among the countries it mentions "South Africa," and that is all.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. DOW. Among the countries it mentions South Africa, but does not say whether it is the Government or so many black people or white people. I would suggest to the gentleman, let us stick to the wording in the bill.

Mr. BELCHER. Does the gentleman know how many black people in South Africa get benefits out of this sugar bill?

Mr. DOW. I would say many less than should be getting them.

Mr. REID of New York. Would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BELCHER. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REID of New York. I believe I can answer the question of the distinguished ranking minority member.

There are 15 white-owned corporations that produce 92 percent of the sugar. Bantus are responsible for only 2.3 percent of the sugar produced, in terms of ownership and management. The average field worker's wage, including food, rations, and housing, amounts to only 86 cents per day.

So the point the gentleman is making, which is suggestive of the fact that there are blacks who participate in a significant number and do well economically, is not correct. The facts I think show the reverse.

Mr. BELCHER. That is propaganda. They get $1.60 and then they have 45 cents a day which they receive above that in other ways. That compares favorably with the sugarcane people's wages in any other country.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELCHER. Yes. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the gentleman from New York. Without for a moment questioning his facts, because I have no reason to think they are not correct, how would we be doing the black people of South Africa any service if we took away from them what they have now?

Mr. REID of New York. If the gentleman will yield to me, first, as the gentleman knows, I have been refused a visa to enter South Africa unless I made no public statements but I have had a

chance to talk to some of the black people who live there, including the winner of the Nobel Prize. I feel very strongly that the system of indenture is repugnant to basic principles and that the black South Africans are totally against apartheid.

Mr. BELCHER. I can answer the gentleman from California when he asked the gentleman from New York why he wanted to take away the benefits from the people of South Africa. They cannot vote in any of the districts in America. That is why.

Mr. DIGGS. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BELCHER. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DIGGS. They cannot vote in any district in South Africa, either. That is one of the terrible things about this entire monstrosity.

Mr. BELCHER. If you keep them down and poverty stricken all their lives, they will never get the vote in South Africa.

Mr. DIGGS. If the gentleman will yield further, does he know anything about the wage disparities and conditions in South Africa? They do not need any help from us with respect to keeping them in poverty. They are being kept in poverty, kept in disease and in hunger, and in every other form of degradation that anyone can think of right now.

Mr. BELCHER. If you are their friends, they do not need any enemies.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may use to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 471 which provides for 3 hours of general debate on the Sugar Act Amendments under a closed rule. I voted against a closed rule in the Rules Committee yesterday because I was impressed by the testimony of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE), the gentleman from New York (Mr. DOW), and others in opposition to the inclusion of South Africa under the sugar quota system. The very valid point was raised that South Africa clearly does not qualify for such special treatment under the criteria established by the House Agriculture Committee which require that these quotas be extended only to those countries which have very special present needs and are still in the process of developing economically. South Africa does not qualify under these criteria. It is classified by our own Agency for International Development as a developed rather than developing country.

But even more importantly, it seems to me, granting a sugar quota to South Africa is in clear contravention to the 1967 congressional statement of policy which sets certain criteria for increased economic cooperation and trade with other nations. One of these criteria is a nation's nondiscriminatory racial policy. And yet, if ever there was a clear example of de jure racial discrimination, it is South Africa's policy of apartheid which perpetuates the rule of a 4-million white minority population at the expense of the rights and freedom of a 17-million nonwhite majority population.

Not only are the nonwhites denied their basic rights, but those whites who disagree with the apartheid policy are also discriminated against by the state. I am sure many of you read in this morning's paper that the South African Government has temporarily lifted a 9-year house arrest against a 66-year-old white woman, Mrs. Helen Joseph, to permit her to enter the hospital for surgery. Since she came to South Africa in 1930, Mrs. Joseph has been an outspoken critic of the country's race laws, and in 1962, without a trial, she has been confined to her quarters, in the words of the newspaper account, "so restricted that she must stay alone in her home at night and at weekends, must report daily to a police station and can only talk to other people one at a time." She has had to give up a job she held for 15 years as a secretary to a medical aid society because its offices were in the same building as a union. She is not even allowed to have her pet dog with her. The article concludes:

> It is a savage irony . . . that it took a severe illness for her to be able to enjoy the warmth of human companionship during evenings and weekends for the first time in nine years.

Mr. Speaker, I think this gives you some idea of the extent of discrimination in that country, not only against nonwhites, but those whites who have the courage of their convictions when it comes to questions of racial equality.

I fail to see why we should give preferential quota treatment to a country which is developed economically, but is underdeveloped when it comes to the treatment of the vast majority of citizens who happen to be nonwhite. I therefore urge defeat of this rule so that we can open up the bill and delete the quota and prorations for South Africa.

Pertinent items from the June 10, 1971, Washington Post follow:

SOUTH AFRICA'S TOP PARTY DIVIDING

(By Stanley Uys)

CAPE TOWN, SOUTH AFRICA.—The Nationalist Party, which has ruled South Africa monolithically for 23 years, has begun to tear itself apart. Its leaders disagree over specific issues and over basic policy. Prime Minister B. J. Vorster is unable to do anything about it: the situation is largely out of his control.

The simplest explanation is that the whites are losing faith in apartheid. The Nationalist Party postponed adjusting its policies to changing times until it became unavoidable, and then it could not be contained.

A power vacuum is forming. The 17 million nonwhites are not aspirants for this power yet; nor, indeed, are the opposition half of the 4 million whites, although they believe their time is fast approaching.

This is still an Afrikaner (white South Africans) struggle. Polarities of "right" and "left" (relative terms purely) are forming, with Afrikaner nationalists ranging themselves in varying states of self-confidence and uncertainty, aggression and alarm.

A leading commentator in a government newspaper has said that Afrikaners have not been in such a state of ferment since Sharpeville in 1960, where 67 Africans were shot dead at a demonstration for freedom.

Discussion groups are springing up within Afrikaner ranks, especially in academic circles, questioning the very precepts on which apartheid is founded.

S. P. Cilliers, professor of sociology at Stellenbosch, mother of the Afrikaner universities, has suggested that the solution of South Africa's race problem should be sought not in the government's policy of designating every single African (nonwhite) in the country as a citizen of one or other of the eight African "nation-states" it is setting up within South Africa's borders, or in accepting a common society in which all citizens, whatever their race, will be equal eventually, but in both.

Professor Cilliers estimates that the nation-states, or Bantustans, will support about half the African population (though they comprise only 13 per cent of the total area of the republic). He proposes that the other half should share a common society with the whites, coloreds (those of mixed descent) and Asians. This half of the Africans, it might be noted, would outnumber all other race groups together; it shows how far Afrikaner intellectual thinking is probing.

The ferment in Afrikanerdom has progressed so far that the government has found it necessary to try to woo the deviationists back and to put spies on to them as well. Supporters of the opposition have suffered from this kind of treatment over the years; now it is the turn of Afrikaners.

Indications so far are that the right wing is winning the power struggle in Afrikanerdom.

The word "apartheid," quietly buried some years ago and replaced by "separate development," "separate freedoms" and "multinational development," is being defiantly resurrected.

At several critical points, a hard line has been taken. Under pressure to relax the industrial color bar, the censorship laws and symbolic legislation like the Immorality Act (which prohibits sexual relations across the color line) the Vorster government returned an emphatic "No."

The most telling evidence though is that, in behind-the-scenes rivalry for the premiership, left-wing or "verligte" Afrikaners (verligte meaning enlightened, as against fundamentalist) have found they have no chance of getting their man elected.

The prospect faces South Africa, therefore, that "verkrampte"-led Afrikaners could take over the government.

The Nationalist Party has such a big majority in Parliament—118 of the 166 seats in the House of Assembly—that even if a small left wing were to rip away, the right wing conceivably could still form a government. Such a government, of course, would come even more violently into collision with the new economic and political forces in the country, and it would have to employ ever tougher measures to give itself the minimum stability needed to govern.

The left wing is too thin on the ground to carry weight at the polls. They number some politicians, academics, newspaper editors, churchmen and Afrikaner businessmen.

The point, however, is approaching in which the left and right wings' concept will no longer be reconcilable within the Nationalist Party.

There is an alternative remedy: for the left wing to enter a coalition with the Opposition United Party, splitting Afrikanerdom and creating a new government based principally on white, not Afrikaner, unity.

This idea is being lobbied energetically, especially by businessmen who have taken fright at the deterioration in the economic situation. But the economic situation will

have to get a lot worse before coalition becomes a practical proposition.

The crisis in Afrikanerdom began three years ago when a right-wing revolt started in the government led by Dr. Albert Hertzog. The revolt was limited to four members of parliament and then crushed at the elections last year, but its psychological impact was immense. It showed that the Nationalist Party was mortal.

This unleashed pent-up grievances among Afrikaners.

All this led to the election reverses suffered by Vorster's government in the parliamentary and provincial council general elections last year. From that point on the Vorster government has known nothing but trouble.

Many Afrikaners have started to outgrow the Nationalist Party. They have had their republic for 10 years now (a dream come true), they have lost some of their obsessive fears of being swamped by the Africans, and they have become more affluent and selfassured.

Now, suddenly, whites have been getting glimpses of the bitterness that has accumulated in the closed world of their segregated townships—bitterness that reveals itself, for example, in localized, instant explosions, as over bus fares, or train accidents (which occur with disturbing frequency on the congested nonwhite runs).

SOUTH AFRICA FREES MRS. JOSEPH AFTER 9 YEARS OF HOUSE ARREST

(By Peter Gregson)

JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA.—Grey-haired Helen Joseph is enjoying fulltime human companionship for the first time in nearly nine years—from a hospital bed.

But even there she is careful to receive only one visitor at a time to avoid contravening a restriction order that has dominated her life since October 13, 1962.

On that day, the 66-year-old British-born Mrs. Joseph was the first person in South Africa to be served with a five-year, banning-and-house-arrest order.

It was imposed without trial under South Africa's stringent Suppression of Communism Act, intended to defend the country from communism and sabotage. She has never been charged in a court of law.

Mrs. Joseph's banning order was imposed by John Worster, then minister of justice and now prime minister, for allegedly furthering the aims of communism.

Five years of loneliness and isolation later, the order was automatically renewed—condemning her to an existence so restricted that she must stay alone in her home at night and at weekends, must report daily to a police station and can only talk to other people one at a time.

Recently the house arrest was temporarily set aside to allow Mrs. Joseph to go into a hospital, where a few days later she underwent major surgery for breast cancer.

The bespectacled Mrs. Joseph, a sociologist, is one of the few people in South Africa still subject to house arrest order.

The restriction order also prevents anything she says or has written from being quoted in any publication sold in South Africa, and bars her from participating in the preparation of news materials—stopping her from being interviewed even by the foreign press.

She cannot communicate with any other banned person and is barred from entering the premises of any newspaper, factory, educational institute or union offices.

This means she had to give up a job she held for 15 years as secretary to a medical aid society, because its offices were in the same building as a union. Mrs. Joseph now works for a bookshop.

She must also stay alone—apart from her pet dog and cat—in her tiny bungalow home in the modest northern Johannesburg suburb of Northwood between 6:30 p.m. and 6:30 a.m. on weekdays.

These hours are extended at weekends from 2:30 p.m. on Saturday to 6:30 a.m. on Monday, apart from a two-hour period on Sunday to attend church—a concession only granted after her sixth year of house arrest.

The weekend limits are also extended on public holidays.

Friends say she lives in constant dread of breaking the stringent rules. For being late home in the evening she faces six months imprisonment and was once jailed for four days for failing to make her daily report to the police.

She keeps a suitcase permanently packed in case she breaks her curfew and is taken to the cells.

A few months ago Mrs. Joseph was harassed by a series of anonymous threatening telephone calls and last month a small explosive device was found fixed to her front gate.

Even though she is forced to stay alone, she still cannot be sure of privacy for the police can enter her home at any time.

Mrs. Joseph came to South Africa in 1930 and soon became known as an outspoken critic of the country's race laws.

She was a founder member of the now-outlawed South African Congress of Democrats and was among those accused and acquitted in a marathon five-and-a-half-year treason trial which began in the late 1950s.

Her face is now lined with age and worry. Friends say that recently the strain of her illness and nearly nine years of house arrest have started to tell on her.

Now in a bed in a public ward in Johannesburg's General Hospital, she can talk to nurses, doctors and other patients. It is a savage irony her friends say, that it took a severe illness for her to be able to enjoy the warmth of human companionship during evenings and weekends for the first time in nine years.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

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

HISTORIC TRADE ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, just before noon today President Nixon made an announcement on international trade that must rank as one of the most progressive, promising steps of the entire postwar era.

He announced that grains, most other farm products, and a wide variety of manufactured goods can be sold under general license to the People's Republic of China, and further than he is rescinding the unfortunate, unproductive, unwise restriction on the sale of certain grains to Communist bloc countries under which half of such shipments must be made in U.S. vessels. Finally, he has lifted the requirement of specific licenses on certain agricultural shipments to Communist bloc countries.

These restrictions, and especially the one on cargo preference have had the effect of denying American farmers the opportunity to compete for worldwide grain business averaging about one billion bushels a year.

To me, the President's announcement is the greatest advance for the economic well-being of the farmer in at least 10 years, and also represents a great initiative toward peaceful relations. It will help to open communication with the world's most populous nation and will end the double standard, under which U.S. policy has given the Soviet Union a favored position over Communist China.

Here is the text of the President's announcement:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
June 10, 1971.

The President announced today the first broad steps in the termination of U.S. controls on a large list of non-strategic U.S. exports to the People's Republic of China. In the future, a range of U.S. products listed on the attached sheet may be freely sold to China under open general export licenses without the need to obtain Department of Commerce permission for each specific transaction.

The items to be released from trade controls have been recommended by the NSC Under Secretaries Committee chaired by the Department of State. They include: most farm, fish and forestry products; tobacco; fertilizers; coal; selected chemicals; rubber; textiles; certain metals; agricultural, industrial and office equipment; household appliances; electrical apparatus in general industrial or commercial use; certain electronic and communications equipment; certain automotive equipment and consumer goods.

The President has also decided to terminate the need to obtain Department of Commerce permission for the export of wheat, flour and other grains, to China, Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, suspending the 50% U.S. shipping requirement for these items.

Items not on the open general license list may be considered for specific licensing consistent with the requirements of U.S. national security. The Department of Commerce and other agencies will continue to review our export controls.

The President has also decided to permit all imports to enter from China under a general license, while retaining standby authority for future controls if necessary. Imports from the People's Republic of China will be subject to the tariff rates generally applicable to goods from most Communist countries. They will also be subject to the normal conditions governing our imports from all sources such as cotton textile controls and anti-dumping and countervailing duty legislation.

GENERAL LICENSE LIST FOR PEOPLES REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Food and live animals, including grains.

Beverages and tobacco.

Hides and skins.

Animal and vegetable oils and fats; oil seeds, nuts, and kernels, and flour and meal thereof.

Crude natural rubber and certain synthetic rubbers.

Wood, lumber, and cork.

Pulp and waste paper.

Most textile fibers.

Manufactured fertilizers, except those closely related to explosives; crude fertilizers and crude minerals such as sulfur, iron pyrites, and natural asphalt.

Crude animal and vegetable materials.

Coal and coke, except gilsonite.

Selected organic and inorganic chemicals, including certain defoliants, herbicides, pesticides and insecticides.

Most dyeing, tanning and coloring materials, printing inks and paint.

Medicinal and pharmaceutical products, with minimal exceptions.

Essential oils and perfume materials; toilet and polishing preparations and cleansing preparations.

Miscellaneous chemical materials and products in general use.

Leather, leather manufactures and dressed fur skins.

Rubber manufactures, except military type tires, aircraft tires and tubes and other specialized commodities.

Wood and cork manufactures and paper and paperboard and manufactures thereof.

Textile yarn, fabrics and related products, except used or reject or reject fabric bearing design of U.S. flag or commodities made of strategic-type synthetics.

Common metals, ferrous and nonferrous including steel, iron, tungsten, lead, zinc, tin, titanium, chromium and manganese. Forms include ores, concentrates, nonferrous scrap, ingots, castings, bars, plate, shapes, wire and pipe.

Metal manufactures such as septic tanks, gas cylinders, containers, cables, fencing.

Certain agricultural and dairy machines, internal combustion engines, water turbines and engines, wheel tractors, and tillers and parts and accessories.

Certain office machines such as typewriters, checkwriters, calculators, accounting machines, duplicators, and parts and accessories.

Computers, certain low-grade analog and digital types.

Manually operated metal polishing and buffing machines, and portable pipe bending machines, and part; certain foundry equipment.

Machinery for textile, pulp and paper, printing, food processing and glassworking industries.

Certain construction and maintenance equipment, such as road rollers, ditchers, trenchers, snow plows, plaster and concrete mixers, concrete and bituminous pavers, finishers, and spreaders, and parts and accessories.

Certain types of air conditioners and refrigerating equipment and compressors therefor; furnaces; furnace burners; stokers; bakery ovens; cooking and food warming equipment, and parts and accessories.

General purpose pumps, such as beverage, fuel, household water, service station, measuring and dispensing pumps for fuels.

Filters, purifiers, and softeners for water treatment, sewage disposal, and commercial and industrial engines, and parts.

Certain lifting, loading, and handling machines and equipment, such as industrial lift trucks and tractors, jacks, lifts, elevators and moving stairways, winches, and parts.

Weighing machines and scales, and automatic merchandising machines, and parts.

Sprayers and dusters for agricultural, industrial or commercial uses, and parts.

General industrial types of metallic and nonmetallic manufactures, such as cement and fabricated building materials, valves and regulators, and measuring and checking instruments.

Certain types of general industrial and commercial machines and mechanical appliances, such as power operated nonelectric hand tools, machines for working wood, ceramics and stone; and packing, wrapping, filling, and sealing machines.

Electrical apparatus in general industrial or commercial use, such as generators, transformers, circuit breakers, storage batteries, telephone and telegraph equipment, test equipment, and hand tools.

Certain electronic tubes, resistors, capacitors, transistors, and other electronic parts.

Home-type radio and television receivers, refrigerators, freezers, water heaters, washing machines, parts and accessories.

Medical and dental apparatus.

Automobiles and other road vehicles: passenger cars, rear axle drive; motor cycles, motor bikes and scooters; invalid carriages and certain trailers, and parts therefor.

Sanitary plumbing, and heating and lighting fixtures and fittings.

Consumer-type optical goods, certain laboratory instruments, surveying, and engineering instruments, certain photographic materials.

Watches, clocks, and parts.

Recording and reproducing equipment for voice and music only, dictating machines, phonographs, record players, musical instruments, and parts.

Consumer goods such as furniture, clothing, footwear, works of art, jewelry, silverware, printed matter, children's goods, office supplies, sporting goods.

Coins, not gold and not legal tender.

President Nixon's wise decision will be applauded by American farmers and the public generally. He alone has had the courage to take the initiative where no former President in the last two decades has dared. This step will measurably strengthen the fabric of peace.

As a foreign policy initiative, the President's decision has tremendous potential impact. No longer will the United States show favoritism toward Moscow and ignore Peking. Trade with each country is now virtually on the same basis, as it should be. By our actions, we recognize the world power status of the Peoples Republic of China and demonstrate our willingness to deal with them on a realistic basis.

As a trade policy initiative, President Nixon's decision is even more promising. The cargo preference restriction, which requires that 50 percent of grain being shipped to a Communist country go in U.S. vessels, has long precluded American farmers from selling wheat and corn to these countries. The reason is that American shipping charges are three times those of most other nations. As a result, the 50-percent requirement meant 50 percent of nothing—50 percent of nothing for labor, 50 percent of nothing for farmers, 50 percent of nothing for businessmen, and 50 percent of nothing to help balance our foreign payments.

President Nixon's decision changes all of this. Now our farmers will be able to sell grain abroad. Only last week the Soviet Union purchased 135 million bushels of wheat from Canada and paid the whopping price of $230 million. Perhaps now the American farmer will have a chance at such sales.

Also, placing grain under general license to China, Eastern Europe, and the Soviet Union opens up vast opportunities for trade. All of these nations import large quantities of grain each year. The long and complex procedures required in the past to get a special license to ship grain have been more than most Communist nations are willing to put up with. Thus, Canadian farmers and those of other nations benefit, while the American farmer, the most efficient producer in the world, suffers reduced sales.

President Nixon has now changed all of this. He has given America's foreign image a new shrine, and he has given American farmers, labor, and businessmen new opportunities. He deserves the highest praise of us all.

Mr. Speaker, I am placing here the text of two letters I have sent recently to the President on this subject, together with excerpts from a speech I made before the Chicago Agricultural Economists Club on April 22, 1969:

APRIL 29, 1971.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Salute to Agriculture which you have planned for May 6–7 is a timely recognition of the vital contribution to the nation's welfare by American farmers. My purpose in writing is to suggest four steps you can take which would have a direct and potentially dramatic effect upon the ability of American farmers to sell their products in world markets. For years, United States agricultural exports to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union have languished because of outdated attitudes and policies. In my judgment, it is time to eliminate the self-imposed and self-defeating restrictions on valuable cash markets for our agricultural products. These restrictions prevent the American farmer from competing effectively in world cash markets for grain and other agricultural products, while gaining no advantage for other United States interests.

It would be especially appropriate for you to announce at the events planned to honor American agriculture that you have ordered the following changes:

1. Rescind the cargo preference restriction which requires that 50 per cent of all wheat and most feed grain shipments to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union must go in United States vessels. Because our costs in U.S. shipping are so much higher than those of other nations, this requirement is self-defeating. It adds so much to the cost of buying grain in the U.S.—about 25 per cent—that Eastern European nations almost always buy elsewhere. To illustrate, Canadian farmers last year sold over $90 million worth of wheat to Eastern Europe and the U.S.S.R. The American farmer suffered the consequences of reduced sales. The 50 per cent requirement is a hardship on farmers and provides no advantage to U.S. shipping interests.

2. Eliminate the requirement that shipment of grain to certain Eastern European countries and the Soviet Union must be partly unloaded at a non-communist port. This requirement serves no purpose whatsoever, adds to shipping costs, and prohibits Eastern European and Soviet buyers from making efficient full-load bids. The result, again, is that American farmers lose sales in the world market.

3. Increase the number of agricultural products under general license to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. The requirement that wheat and feed grains, but not soybeans, must have specific licenses for export makes little sense. It only adds delay, uncertainty, and expense to the other burdens which an importing country faces when buying American agricultural products.

4. Apply to the Peoples Republic of China only those restrictions on trade which are applied to the Soviet Union. The U.S.S.R. has done nothing to merit special or preferred treatment. Your recent decision to permit trade with the Peoples Republic is the most important step to ease tensions with Peking taken by our country in over a quarter century. I urge you to follow it up by placing the largest number of agricultural and other products possible under general license for export to China. In addition, I hope that you will decide not to impose cargo preference and part cargo restrictions on trade between the two countries. To apply these restrictions now to China would work at cross purposes with the wise initiatives which you have undertaken with respect to the Peoples Republic, and would jeopardize the good will which you have been building.

The four steps suggested above hold great promise for expanded world markets for

American agricultural products. Given the opportunity to compete in all markets on an equal basis with farmers from other countries, the American farmer will acquit himself well. To the extent that he is able to sell more of his products abroad, he will have to rely less upon government support at home.

In addition, the four steps suggested are sound politically in that they will strengthen the fabric of peace and add to international stability and prosperity.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Member of Congress.

MAY 26, 1971.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: One of the principal reasons your commendable initiatives in regard to trade with the Peoples Republic of China have been so well received is the promise they hold for enlarged markets for American farmers.

China represents a splendid potential market especially for American wheat, as the varieties we produce are more suited to Chinese needs than the Canadian varieties.

Chinese planners will quickly find it economically desirable to purchase the lower priced U.S. wheat rather than the more expensive Canadian-Manitoba wheat.

China has every reason to become a permanent importer of U.S. wheat on a substantial scale, provided of course we give them the opportunity.

I write to you with a sense of urgency, because I am informed that you may be close to a decision on which items to place under general license for export to China. It is my further understanding that one of the principal alternatives now before you would exclude all grain, including wheat, from general license authority.

In my view, exclusion of grain from general license would be a mistake of very grave proportions.

In terms of our national security interests, it would risk derisive reaction by China. Peking might well respond that the exclusion of food grain shows the U.S. trade initiative to be empty.

It would also hurt market prospects for America's farmers. You of course are well aware of the cost-price squeeze bearing so heavily on farmers and the market difficulties they face in Europe.

Finally, it would have grave political implications for all Republicans in 1972. The reversals our party suffered in the 1970 Congressional elections were the greatest in wheat-producing areas.

I realize the dilemma you face in regard to grain trade with Communist nations. The cargo preference restriction established by President Kennedy in 1963, in connection with the wheat sales to the Soviet Union, still remains in effect. Under this restriction, half of grain shipments to Communist countries must go in U.S. vessels. Its purpose was primarily to placate U.S. labor and shipping interests, but labor surely now realizes that it gains no advantage. Because shipping costs in U.S. vessels are much higher than those of other countries, the cargo preference restriction has had the effect of barring U.S. grain from Soviet and Eastern European markets. Many other farm commodities, like soybean meal, are exempt from cargo preference, and sell well in these same countries. This is a hardship on farmers and provides no real advantage to U.S. maritime interests, including labor. If it is applied to grain shipments to China, it will just as effectively bar grain trade with that country.

The cargo preference restriction is the only major obstacle to including grain for general license to China. This restriction hurts American farmers, American labor, and American business. The time to remove it is now.

Taken together, the termination of this out-dated restriction and the general licensing of grain to China will represent a major advance in relations with that country, will open expanded farm product markets in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, as well as China, and will give Republican prospects in 1972 a richly deserved boost.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

FARM EXPORT OPPORTUNITIES IN COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

(By Representative PAUL FINDLEY)

The time has come for the United States to shake off some outmoded, self-defeating restrictions on agricultural trade with Communist countries. Many of them arise from false assumptions about the role of China in the Korean war, others from mistaken theories about the impact of trade on the behavior of Eastern European countries.

Review and modification are timely because of both political and economic factors.

Our political interests would be served by initiatives to exploit the deep and relatively permanent split between China and the Soviet Union, and persistent pressures within Eastern Europe for greater external and internal independence.

Our economic interests would be served because increased agricultural cash markets overseas will help to meet income problems of American farmers, and our worsening problems in national trade and payments balances.

Here is what I propose:

1. Lift the total embargo on U.S. trade with China. Treat trade with China the same as trade with the Soviet Union. This requires an end to the totally irrational double standard now followed.

2. Rescind the requirement that 50 per cent of certain grain cargoes to Eastern Europe must be carried in U.S. vessels.

3. Rescind the requirement which prohibits full-cargo grain shipment to Eastern Europe.

4. Rescind the requirement of specific license for agricultural exports to Communist countries, except of course for commodities in short supply.

5. Request permission to establish a trade mission in Canton, China, site of the semi-annual trade fair.

6. Permit the President to extend most-favored-nation tariff privileges to Czechoslovakia and also to other countries when they have become members of GATT (General Agreements on Trade and Tariffs).

7. Establish agricultural attaches in each embassy in Eastern Europe.

Most of these changes can be accomplished by Executive Order. Only the one authorizing the extension of MFN tariff privileges requires legislation.

Overnight President Nixon could clear away serious obstacles to the expansion of our agricultural trade and at the same time improve our position relative to the Soviet Union in the field of world power politics, all without firing a shot, pointing a gun or even building new arms. Political improvement would occur almost instantly, even though actual trade expansion might be months or even years in developing.

Even when trade expansion develops, no strategic disadvantages can be anticipated. My recommendations would impair in no way whatever the system of controls on the export of strategic goods. This would remain in full force. Nor would the new policies in any sense subsidize unfriendly regimes, because they deal entirely with trade, not aid.

The restrictions which I suggest be terminated have not caused Communist countries to do without. Rather, by imposing costly hindrances on U.S. commercial enterprise, they have caused American farmers to do without.

Most of these policies developed before it became clear that the Korean war was almost entirely a Soviet enterprise, with the Chinese role comparatively modest. The war was both started and stopped by the Soviets—not China—yet we trade with the Soviets and refuse to trade with China.

In Eastern Europe the development of trade will help to make the Soviet satellite nations less dependent on Moscow, and bring them more into the habits of the private marketplace.

It would be a mistake, of course, to assume that these new policies will soon lead to substantial markets. It would also be a mistake to expect too much in the way of political returns from these initiatives. At the same time, I firmly believe that U.S. moves showing we want to normalize relations with China and Eastern Europe will do more than anything else to make Soviet behavior more reasonable.

LIFT THE CHINA EMBARGO

Presently the United States prohibits all trade with China. This embargo was not initiated because the Communists took control of the mainland. It was initiated because of Chinese intervention in the Korean war.

The Communists proclaimed their republic October 1, 1949 and U.S. trade with China was normal, although small, until December, 1950, when Chinese troops crossed the Yalu river. Although the Korean armistice was signed in June, 1953—almost sixteen years ago—the embargo continues, because the national emergency proclaimed shortly after the war started has continued in effect.

This is difficult to justify.

Although the United Nations labeled China the aggressor in the Korean war, it is now a clearly established historical fact that it was North Korea, aided and encouraged by Russia that was the aggressor. North Korea was heavily supplied by Moscow. As a practical fact, the Korean war was both started and stopped by the Soviet Union. Chinese troops entered only as U.N. forces approached the China border.

Yet we trade with Russia, and refuse to trade with China.

Moreover, fifteen other nations fought alongside the United States in the Korean war, among them France, Britain, Canada and Australia. Each suffered considerable losses, yet each now carries on substantial trade with China. Is everyone out of step but us?

Political considerations alone make desirable a review of our trade embargo against China. China is no longer a satellite of Moscow, if it ever was. Doubtless Moscow and Peking have certain doctrinal solidarity and other common interests, but they have deep, abiding differences.

Foremost among the differences are border disputes. The vast common border between the two states is the longest in the world, and tension is certain to mount as China asserts its historical claims on territory.

In formulating our policies, we would be wise to recall the advice of Klauswitz, "Support the weaker of your two adversaries. Accept the risk of abetting a potential future menace in order to check the present one."

Lifting the embargo would serve to end the curious, irrational double standard we now apply in dealing with China and the Soviet Union. In dealing with the Soviet Union we have sought to build bridges, political contacts and trade, believing this in the long run will help to modify Soviet behavior and make Moscow a more responsible member of the world community. In dealing with China, our policy has been just the opposite. While we seek to expand contacts with Rus-

sia, we reject them with China. While we seek to enlarge Soviet participation in world affairs, we oppose such by China.

Attempting to justify this double standard is especially difficult in light of the fact that Chinese forces were long ago withdrawn from Korea, in striking contrast to the Soviet armies still present in Poland, Hungary, East Germany, and Czechoslovakia.

It just isn't true that the Soviets, like the Dodge boys, are always presumed to wear the white hats.

Our action lifting the trade embargo may not yield early results. It takes two to trade. Given the mutual suspicion and distrust which have marked recent U.S.-China history, relations will not improve overnight.

In fact, our action lifting the embargo should be accompanied by a statement listing several other important new policies.

The United States should declare that:

1. We will have no part in any effort to gang up with Russia against China.

2. We have no military designs on the mainland, and will not support any such adventures.

3. We stand ready to exchange diplomats, tourists, businessmen and cultural groups whenever China is ready.

New policies certainly make good sense from the standpoint of American farmers. Although recent wheat shipments to China have declined, the overall trend shows great potential. In the period, 1960–67, Canada shipped 454 million bushels of wheat to China. Australia shipped 532 million bushels, Argentina 159 million, France 78 million.

Of this market totalling over a billion bushels, American farmers provided not a single one.

Ironically, in 1961 when the Canadians first started shipping wheat to China, the minister for agriculture in the Canadian conservative government offered, in a private meeting with President Kennedy, to split the China order with the United States. President Kennedy refused.

TRADE HANDICAPS IN EASTERN EUROPE

Agricultural trade with Communist states in Eastern Europe involve still different problems and handicaps. No embargo exists with Poland, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Romania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary or the Soviet Union. Two of these countries as members of GATT, have most-favored-nation treatment which puts their tariff schedule on par with all free-world countries.

Nevertheless, our trade languishes.

Although our total trade with the East is very small, most of it is composed of agricultural products. Improving this trade is hindered by four principal factors: One is tariff discrimination against all of these countries except Poland and Yugoslavia. Lifting this discrimination requires legislation.

The other three limiting factors can all be removed by Presidential Order. Each of them adds unfair competitive costs to U.S. shippers. One is the requirement that 50 percent of certain shipments must go in U.S. vessels. This applies to all wheat and feed grain shipments to the Soviet Union, and to all wheat shipments to Eastern Europe except Poland, Romania, and Yugoslavia. This adds about 25 percent to the cost of shipment and effectively blocks U.S. farmers from most deals. This requirement is therefore no help to the U.S. merchant fleet and clearly hurts the farmer. If our merchant fleet merits subsidy, the subsidy should be provided directly.

Another requirement provides that certain shipments must be partly unloaded at non-Communist ports. This applies to all feed grain shipments to Eastern Europe except Poland, Romania, and Yugoslavia.

How foolish this can get is illustrated by the fact that a shipment of corn to Czechoslovakia cannot meet the part-cargo requirement by stopping off at Poland, even though a full-cargo shipment to Poland is permitted. This too impairs the competitive position of the U.S. shipper, because it prohibits efficient full-load bids.

The final restrictive provision requires a specific license for each shipment to most of these countries. The legality of this requirement may be questioned, but it is being enforced and of course adds to the cost of doing business.

In many instances these countries manufacture few items the United States is interested in. But the most serious restriction is that goods imported from these countries, with the exceptions of Poland and Yugoslavia, are at present required to pay higher duties than those levied on similar goods from other countries. This is the result of congressional action providing for the withdrawal of equal tariff treatment or the so-called most-favored-nation treatment. This provision was first enacted in the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 as a result of the Korean war.

Since the Korean war has been over for sixteen years it would make good sense to allow the President the authority to extend the benefits of equal tariff treatment to those Eastern European countries, with the exception of East Germany, not now receiving it.

Accordingly, I will soon introduce the East-West Trade Bill of 1969, which will authorize the President to extend this tariff treatment to any country which is or becomes a member of GATT but which does not now receive MFN.

Before we can realistically expect to increase agricultural exports we must extend MFN to these countries. This is so because in order for these countries to buy agricultural products from us they must earn U.S. dollars. These dollars, in the absence of long-term credit arrangements, can be secured in only one way: through selling their exports.

What are the prospects for agricultural trade in these countries?

Let's take the example of wheat. In 1967 our neighbor Canada, a strong friend which has supported us in many ways, sold 228.7 million bushels of wheat to Communist countries. Canada sold 5.13 million bushels to Albania, 6.18 to Czechoslovakia, 5.0 to East Germany, 18.5 to Poland, 110.6 to Russia and 82.5 to China.

Although the United States is the world's largest wheat exporter, Eastern Europe has not been an important U.S. market. For instance, during the second half of the 1950's, U.S. exports to Eastern Europe accounted for only 2.5 per cent of U.S. wheat exports. In the 1960's it is still less than 5 per cent.

The Soviet Union has been the principal wheat supplier in Eastern Europe, but because Russian agricultural output is unpredictable and often tied with political strings, Eastern European countries look for alternative sources. And they have been looking to the West. Unfortunately, the United States has been left out. While U.S. wheat shipments account for 1 per cent of Eastern Europe's imports, Canada supplied 16 per cent and France 35 per cent.

Eastern Europe, like China, is a net importer of wheat. In fact, the countries of the East generally account for 10 per cent of the world wheat import total. We have been closed out of this market. When one considers that we are closed out of the China market too, we compete in only 75 per cent of the total world wheat market, whereas Russia, France, Canada, Australia, Argentina and the other major wheat producers compete in 100 per cent of the market.

What is the trend for the future? Although increases in yield are expected, Eastern Europe will continue to be a wheat deficit area. For instance, in 1970 it is estimated that five countries of Eastern Europe will have a wheat deficit of 3,835,000 metric tons.

What is the situation for other agricultural commodities? It is promising. In the period since World War II, the Eastern European countries have been importers of bread grains, soybeans, soybean meal, ground grains and grain sorghums with protein supplements such as soy and fish meal. Thus, they might well absorb some of the bulge which is likely to result as the United States is squeezed in the highly protectionist-oriented Common Market.

On balance, it appears there will be a growing market for about three major American agricultural products which we produce in abundance—cotton, feed grains, and soybeans.

In looking at the potential trade aspects of Eastern European countries one must not, of course, overlook the fact that these are Communist countries, dominated and run by a single party system in firm control of all aspects of human and business activity. They are firmly tied ideologically to the Marxian Socialist principle.

However, it must also be observed that at the present time each of these countires are insisting on making their own interpretation and application of these principles and some of their economic activities are straying far from basic doctrines. There have developed capitalistic incentives and indeed capitalist methods. In trade and economic matters, there seems to be a major move in all countries to play an in-between role, thus taking advantage of both Eastern and Western trade and economic contracts.

As I see it, the United States should deal imaginatively, but realistically with the several different competing centers of Communist power. Trade can be a most important method to normalize relations with Eastern Europe, realizing, of course, that there are severe limits on the extent to which the United States can reduce Soviet influence there. United States policies towards these Communist countries have been based more on what we would like to see happen, rather than reality. In the long run the natural desire for national self-assertion will rise regardless of United States policies. The Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia can no more prevent this than Pope Leo X could prevent the Reformation.

The United States commitment to peace, democratic government, and orderly change is a long term affair. While it does not preclude our readiness to participate in defensive alliances, or to take appropriate measures against acts of aggression, our national policy is basically committed to the building of a peaceful world. The long term interests of the U.S. would, therefore, be best served by reducing tensions wherever possible and by establishment of normal and durable commercial, technical, scientific, and cultural relations with Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union, and China when they show a reciprocal interest in the pursuit of normal relations. In other words we should be prepared to go as far as they are. In this manner hopefully the nations of the East will see that we have no political or territorial designs on them.

In that regard we need not preach to them of the advantages of national independence and self determination. They already know the advantages. What we should seek is to shape our policies in such a manner as to permit reasonably extensive, profitable and durable relations with individual Communist nations. This requires that we stop viewing the world in terms of an irreconcilable and permanently deadly struggle between all that calls itself Communist and all that does not. We must recognize instead that trade can be among one of the most promising forms for improvement.

The potent movement toward self determination, national identity and political diversity within the Communist camp is a de-

velopment of real significance to the world. It is gradually changing the political content of Communism, impelling the leaders of these countries, especially in Eastern Europe, to give a higher priority to domestic economic and social problems rather than to ideological crusades and territorial expansion. There can be little doubt that a steady, unimpeded mutually profitable exchange of goods between the East and West helps to support this clearly discernible trend towards the more pragmatic, efficiency-minded and consumer-oriented Communist societies of Eastern Europe.

What I propose is trade, not aid.

I do so with a word of caution. If, as I recommend, we lift our embargo on China trade, let the President extend tariff equality to Eastern Europe, start actively promoting our agricultural products in the Communist world, and terminate present requirements on part-cargo, specific licensing and U.S. vessels—even so, I would not anticipate dramatic new advances in trade volume, or in peaceful behavior by Communist authorities. Such advances will take time.

Nor should we drop our military guard, or lessen our diplomatic vigilance. Zealous and fanatical elements—Communist and non-Communist alike—may well for some time seek to impose arbitrarily their political and economic system on us. In the Communist world especially, political and military power is won and kept by intrigue. No one can accurately forecast what tomorrow will bring.

But, while vigilance and preparedness is rational, so is communication. And one of the best and most persuasive means of communication is agricultural commerce.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I appreciate very much the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I take the floor to say very simply that I believe the Members of this House should have an opportunity to vote up or down a question that constitutes the endorsement and support of the apartheid policies of South Africa. Apartheid, in my judgment, is repugnant and contrary to human rights and the basic principles of this country.

Historically, Mr. Speaker, Members might be interested to know that prior to 1962 South Africa exported no sugar to the United States. South Africa was assigned a sugar quota by the United States only when she withdrew from the British Commonwealth to avoid anti-apartheid pressures. South Africa then became a Republic and thereby lost her Imperial Preference Trading status. At the time South Africa needed new sugar markets, we stepped forward to provide a quota which, in my judgment, subsidizes apartheid and holds thousands of workers in South Africa in indentured servitude.

I believe it is time to stop our actions which support this imposed, indentured labor and provide a $5 million annual subsidy to the sugar growers of South Africa. I think it is time for the Members of this House to stand up and be counted on the question of U.S. support for apartheid.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the vote will be strongly against the previous question so that the gentleman from New York (Mr. Dow) can offer an amendment to strike the quota applicable to South Africa. While I feel that there should be an open rule on the entire bill, our immediate goal is to strike the sugar quota for South Africa, and we are, therefore, seeking a limited closed rule that would permit an amendment to do that.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I might point out the fact that allocating a sugar quota to South Africa violates three of the Agriculture Committee's own criteria applicable to foreign quotas: criterion No. 1, dealing with discrimination against U.S. citizens by the quota country; criterion No. 4, dealing with the economic development of the recipient country and its economic need for a quota; and criterion No. 5, dealing with the sharing of benefits among landowners and workers and the socioeconomic policies of the recipient country.

I would like to elaborate for a moment on the first criterion, since I consider it the most important. It reads in its entirety:

Friendly Government to the United States, including non-discrimination against U.S. citizens in the quota country and indemnification for property owned by U.S. citizens in cases of expropriation.

The record of South African discrimination against U.S. citizens is quite clear: I personally was the victim of such discrimination by South Africa which refused to grant me a visa to visit that country in 1969 unless I made no public statements. Similar restrictions were placed upon our colleague (Mr. DIGGS). Arthur Ashe, a leading American tennis player, has been denied a visa to visit South Africa. Crew members of the aircraft carrier *Franklin D. Roosevelt* that docked in South Africa in 1967 would have been subject to apartheid had individual shore leave been granted, as was originally scheduled. Can these actions be described as anything but discrimination against U.S. citizens?

For this reason and others, South Africa should not have a sugar quota and I urge that Members vote against the previous question so that we can offer an amendment to eliminate the South African quota.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHMITZ).

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask a question of several of the previous speakers regarding their opposition to South Africa's policy of apartheid, but I did not get a chance to ask the question. So, I will ask it right now.

All of them are opposed to South Africa's quota on the ground of internal policies of that nation. I wonder how many of those who are indignant about the internal policies of South Africa would exhibit similar indignation regarding today's announced relaxation of trade with Red China. Are they not opposed to its internal policies?

I wonder if they are going to get a special order today to go into this and thus be consistent in their ire about not helping countries with internal policies with which they disagree.

Will the same people who now want to knock South Africa out of participating in this program come back this year or next year with a move to knock out Australia, because Australia has a racially restrictive immigration policy?

In the past we knocked out Rhodesia's quota. Will it be Australia's next year?

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

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

Mr. DOW. It just happens that the business before us today is the sugar quota, the bonanza, which South Africa is receiving.

The question of China and some of these other countries is not before us today. I think we have to keep handling each case based upon its merits.

Mr. SCHMITZ. What about Australia?

Mr. DOW. That is not before us today.

Mr. SCHMITZ. Yes, Australia does have a quota here; it is on page 3. They have basically a whites-only immigration policy. Do you want to knock them out also?

Mr. DOW. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman from California, let me say that there are all degrees of evil in this world. I suspect that China contains some evil, and Australia contains some evil, but certainly South Africa with its apartheid is clearly conducting an outrageous policy.

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

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, this is a fair bill. It has been very carefully thought through, and the committee should be upheld.

Now, may I respectfully suggest to those who are disturbed about what is happening in South Africa that there are other places in the world to be disturbed about, too. Some of them are very near—even in our own hemisphere. There hostile acts toward the United States are occurring with too much frequency. There have been no hostile acts from the Republic of South Africa. They want very much to be our friends. Furthermore, the President of the United States has the power under this bill to suspend quotas wherever conditions justify. This action can be taken wherever there is a need without making a shambles out of this bill.

I realize that South Africa is the target of the present efforts to amend the rule. Let me remind you that if you vote down the rule you will make a shambles out of this bill. You will also create chaos instead or an orderly program. What you propose to do will not help the housewife.

The price of sugar will be just as high to the housewife, whether or not South Africa has a sugar quota.

What you seem to be overlooking is the fact that there are five other African nations that will have quotas raised in this bill or which are in this bill for the first time. I think the committee has taken unusually good care of Africa.

If you vote to take the South African quota away, this will not help the people—you say you want to help the black natives of South Africa. They are the people who are employed in the sugar industry; they are the people who need

work. Take away the sugar quota and where will they turn? By destroying their jobs you will be creating greater problems for them and solving nothing. If you do this thing today you are going to be taking the food out of their mouths.

The industrial owners, the gold and diamond mine owners, will not get hurt. It is the worker who is going to get hurt. Those who claim that they want to be helpful to the workers will actually be taking away their livelihood. Let us take one further look at the nation you are proposing to take a slap at; one of the few countries where communism is not making any progress.

Do you want to help set the stage to encourage the spread of communism? This you will do if you further disrupt the conditions under which people live in South Africa.

The House should sustain the action of the committee, and should vote for the rule which has been offered. It is the only fair and reasonable thing to do if you want to preserve order and to help provide an opportunity for the South Africans to work out their own problems in an orderly way.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN), a member of the committee.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee held hearings on the rule for the so-called Sugar Act legislation, H.R. 8866. The Agriculture Committee submitted its recommendations on the amount of sugar allotment to be extended to various sugar-producing countries throughout the globe. I fully realize that the Agriculture Committee had a very difficult task in allotting the amount of our purchases to selective nations in the sugar-producing field. A number of Members of Congress appeared and testified in opposition to the sugar quota which the Agriculture Committee allotted to South Africa. In fact, the committee increased the percentage allotted South Africa from 1.06 percent to 1.44 percent.

From the testimony before the Rules Committee, I could not understand why an increase should be extended to South Africa when, judging from the testimony, South Africa should be canceled off the list of sugar-producing nations completely by the Congress. History reveals that South Africa, for centuries under the control of the British Government, has been one of the richest colonies and most wealth-producing enslaved nation of all the countries over the globe and has kept the British royalty, its government and its people living in elegance and wealth for generations.

Unfortunately, the Agriculture Committee saw fit to extend a sugar quota that will possibly bring into the South African economy approximately $5 million annually.

The South African Government should be completely barred from participating in the sugar purchase quota of our country for several reasons. One of the most important is that the regime is built upon a system that recognizes and participates in racial discrimination of minorities known as the apartheid policy that has been rejected by all free, liberty-loving nations throughout the world.

In 1970, the Sugar Act lists two pages of criteria which are applicable to foreign quotas. Granting a quota to South Africa violates criterion No. 1, dealing with discrimination against U.S. citizens by the quota country; it violates criterion No. 4, dealing with the economic development of the recipient country and its economic need for a quota; criterion No. 5, dealing with the sharing of benefits among landowners and workers and the socioeconomic policies of the recipient country.

If the Congress follows the above set out criteria on sugar quota recipients, South Africa could not qualify for any consideration in the sugar quota category.

The economic discrimination by the hierarchy in the South African Government against the great majority of its citizens on racial and religious grounds should be the No. 1 reason why South Africa be stricken from the list of sugar quota recipients by this Congress.

For centuries the South African Government has been reaping fabulous income from diamond, gold, and mineral deposits.

The low-income sugar growers in the South African Republic will benefit almost negligibly in any part of this so-called sugar subsidy but the dictatorial hierarchy in control of the South African Government will constitute almost a total of the sugar subsidy recipients. American labor today is competing with the enslaved labor system which continues to exist in South Africa. Millions are living in poverty under a government regime which has not seen fit to inaugurate a modern system of free economy to all citizens and keep pace with the progress of other free nations throughout the globe.

Yesterday I offered a substitute motion in the rules to strike South Africa from the sugar subsidy and was defeated by a vote of 8 to 6. I do hope that today the Congress will take official notice of the injustice created in this pending bill by including South Africa for an annual sugar quota.

South Africa has refused entrance visas to numerous Americans because of their skin color or known opposition to apartheid. It also violates the spirit of a provision in the Foreign Assistance Act aimed at denying aid to governments that violate basic freedoms and practice racial or religious discrimination.

But nothing at all can be said for an annual gift by the American taxpayers of nearly $5 million to the practitioners of apartheid and racial discrimination in South Africa. Members of Congress should be given an opportunity to vote on this important issue and defeat this closed rule which gives 33 members of the Agriculture complete control of our national sugar subsidies.

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, we seem to be quibbling over our position on the internal policies of a variety of countries. I think it is a bit unfortunate that we use the Sugar Act which I think, frankly, by all the evidence and all the testimony has done an excellent job in stabilizing the sugar supply for the American people and the American housewife at reasonable prices.

I would hope that this bill that shortly will be called up would pass, because it is in the best interests of our country.

Let me get to the issue right now. I understand there is going to be an attempt to vote down the previous question. I would urge you to vote for the previous question. There has been no justification that I have heard on this floor or what I heard in committee, and I might say every witness who desired to appear did appear before the Committee on Agriculture on every conceivable kind of issue in connection with sugar foreign policy and other things and no one was cut off. I think we had about 2 months of hearings.

I hold no candle for South Africa's racial policies. I hold no candle, for example, for the military dictatorship in force in the Government of Brazil. I hold no candle for what Peru and Ecuador are doing in connection with the seizure of our fishing boats.

I am not particularly happy with the Dominican Republic and some of the things that have occurred there. I am certainly not happy, and I am sure many of you feel the same over the anti-American attitude that is developing in the Philippines.

If we are going to get down to the point of quibbling about the internal policies of various countries that we are going to depend upon for our sugar supply, then this matter had better be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and let us make a foreign affairs debate out of it.

This legislation is in the interest of America. It is in the interest of stabilizing the supply of sugar for the American people. This bill was not originated to help any foreign country. Do not kid yourselves—this is a self-interest bill. And when we start quibbling about the things that I have heard here during the last 45 minutes, all we are getting ready to do, in my opinion, is to destroy the Sugar Act which is in the best interest of this country, and I think that would be simply deplorable.

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

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman for stating the real purpose of the Sugar Act.

If the real purpose of the Sugar Act is for the protection of American interests, then we must have a stable supply of sugar.

We have given to black Africa an additional sugar quota amounting to more sugar than the total amount given to South Africa in this bill—this is new sugar.

The total that they get is almost 50,000 tons more than is given South Africa.

Those countries are not dependable suppliers, and that is through no fault of their own. Largely because of the de-

velopment of South Africa that country is a dependable supplier. If we are, in fact, interested in protecting America, we should not use this program as an instrument for imposing our ideas of social organization on somebody else, but if we are trying to protect the interest of the American housewives, we will keep some of these countries in this bill which are really dependable suppliers.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his comments.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I should like to point out to the Members that the sugar quota of Malawi went from zero to 15,000 tons. These are all black African countries.

The quota of Uganda was increased from zero to 15,000 tons.

We increased the quota of Swaziland from 7,500 to 30,000 tons.

There was an increase in the quota of the Malagasy Republic from 9,600 to 15,000 tons.

Mauritius was increased from 18,600 to 30,000 tons.

We have leaned over backward in the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture to take care of our black African neighbors of South Africa.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman. Let me say to my friends on both sides of the aisle that I think we have a very important issue here today. There are many amendments that individual Members would like to offer. I would certainly have written this bill differently had I been writing it. I would have given to some countries an increase and I would have cut some. I have already indicated my dissatisfaction with the internal policies of certain countries. But, my friends, that is not the issue here today. If we are going to pass a sugar bill that will stabilize the sugar industry for American consumers we should adopt this rule and get on with the debate.

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY) for a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I oppose H.R. 8866, to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948. In this bill we had an outstanding opportunity to correct a problem that has been facing American fishermen for the last 17 years, but the same permissive language was allowed to remain, and the result is that nothing will be accomplished in the question of the 200-mile sovereignty claimed by some Latin American countries. This language is one more capitulation to the Department of State, and under the closed rule the bill cannot be amended.

I testified before the Committee on Agriculture, and I appreciate the chairman's kindness in hearing my case. The committee did come up with an amendment which provided for a $20-a-ton fine on the sugar quota of any country illegally seizing a U.S. fishing vessel, but unfortunately the imposition of the fine is discretionary with the President. This is where the problem lies, Mr. Speaker. When discretion is given to the executive branch, as in other similar laws, the State Department sees to it that no action unfavorable to any foreign nation is taken.

Recent history well documents what I am saying. The Hickenlooper amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act says the President shall suspend assistance to any country which has nationalized or expropriated or seized ownership or control of property owned by any U.S. citizen. No suspension of aid has been carried out.

Then there is the Pelly amendment to the Fishermen's Protective Act which provides that illegal fines of U.S. fishing boats on the high seas shall be deducted from foreign assistance allocations. No such deductions have ever been made.

Also, there is the Belcher amendment to the Sugar Act, patterned after the Hickenlooper amendment, to cancel the sugar quota of any country expropriating U.S. property without proper compensation, and this too has been ignored. And, the Kuchel amendment to cut off foreign assistance to any country seizing U.S. vessels has been ignored by State.

The action taken by some Latin American countries has been an affront to the United States. They have even used U.S. vessels on loan to them to seize American fishermen. Furthermore, the Ecuadorian Navy receives 70 percent of any fine levied against Americans caught fishing in their claimed waters.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me if our own State Department refuses to institute action under a law passed by Congress, then the Congress must make these laws mandatory. We must provide mandatory language in the law so that we will have a strong enough deterrent to bring all nations to the negotiating table. All else has failed.

I urge defeat of the Sugar Act until it includes mandatory language regarding these illegal seizures.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT) for a unanimous-consent request.

(Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, Philadelphia has been an important cane sugar refining center for decades. Today, it is the home of two large cane sugar refineries, one operated by Amstar Corp. and the other by the National Sugar Refining Co.

These refineries play an important role in meeting the needs of sugar consumers in and around Philadelphia and the Northeastern section of our country. They refine and distribute approximately 2 billion pounds of sugar a year, about three-fourths of which goes to food processors who use sugar as an ingredient in their products. Thus, in addition to providing the refined sugars that are familiar to the retail shopper, the refiners are called upon to provide a number of different types of refined sugar, in both liquid and dry form, for the food processors. Included among the large sugar-using food processors are the bakers, the bottlers, the canners, the confectioners, and the dairy manufacturers.

The refiners' role as distributors of sugar has become more complex in recent years, because of the divergent needs of the food processors. In order to meet these needs, the refiners import sugar from 30 different nations throughout the world. This enables them, in effect, to tap the world's sugar supply, and thereby readily respond to any sudden increase in the demand for sugar.

The advent of the food processors as the big sugar consumers has intensified the need for insuring that our Nation has ample supplies of sugar under all possible conditions. The food processors depend upon the refiners—and in the West, upon the beet processors—to provide the sugar they need on a day-to-day basis. Any interruption in the delivery of sugar from the refineries to the processing plants could be disastrous for the processors. The operation of their plants are dependent upon a constant supply of sugar.

The sugar program, which H.R. 8866 will improve, is designed to insure that an adequate supply of sugar is available to consumers at all times, at fair prices.

I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 8866.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. MELCHER), whatever time he may require.

(Mr. MELCHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I support and advocate renewal of the Sugar Act. I do so because it is a reasonable time-tested method of protecting the interests of both producers and consumers here in America. The consumer retail prices of sugar have risen less than 30 percent in 23 years and has been more stable than the average of all food items, which rose 42 percent during the period.

American farmers who raise either sugar beets or sugarcane need the Sugar Act to assure them a market, but it is not a guarantee of profits, as evidenced by the decline in number of farmers and increased production of remaining farmers trying to get big enough to live on very small margins.

The Department of Agriculture reported 75,000 sugar farmers in 1939 as compared to less than 29,000 in 1969. But the production from the 75,000 farms over 30 years ago was only 4 million tons as compared to 6 million tons in 1969 from less than half as many farms. Average production per farm almost quadrupled, and it had to for the 29,000 growers left if they were to stay in business.

Not all of the sugar processing plants have stayed in business, either. At the start of this year three plants ceased operation because of losses, one of them in my home area at Hardin, Mont. So it is a business with narrow margins for both our American growers and processors.

I believe the proposed bill will give a little stronger price structure in the next 3 years to minimize the economic

dangers for the domestic sugar industry. But the Sugar Act is also a successful part of our Nation's foreign trade policy, particularly for over a score of Latin American and African nations.

It is this aspect of the act that I would favor altering to delete the quota for South Africa.

We have been told of the advantageous trade policy and friendship we have with South Africa—a favorable trade balance of over one-third billion dollars a year, our friendly relationship, allies during World War II, assistance during the Berlin airlift, and allies in the Korean war. We are aware of the dynamic and beautiful country that is South Africa.

Unfortunately we are also aware of a Government policy that tolerates racial attitudes repugnant to most of the world, insulting to the black people of the world, particularly obnoxious to 12 Members of this House and to the 20 million black Americans, but also obnoxious to all Americans.

The 60,000-ton share in the American market that is allowed for South Africa is a small percentage on their total annual production of 1,500,000 tons.

There are 148,000 farmers and workers in their sugar industry and 135,000 of them are black. It is argued that they have no control over their governments' policy and these people will be hurt by the loss of American quota. They are one of the world's largest sugar producers, and we buy only 4 percent of their annual production. Denying them the quota will not be a big blow to the SASA, the sugar association that operates South Africa's modern and efficient sugar mills, warehousing, and shipping. But deny them the quota we should. Ours is a preferential sugar market sought by many countries. We pay 2 cents a pound more than South Africa's next best foreign market. We are not obligated to give any country a sugar quota, and we should not legislate a quota for a foreign country if there is a serious American objection to that country's actions.

A serious objection does exist in my judgment in the case of South Africa. Because of their racial policies, which repel my sense of decency and insults the black people of America and the world, I voice my objection and urge the House to do likewise by amending the act and deleting the South African quota. Because their government is ruled by white English-speaking people like myself, I feel shamed by their oppression of their black countrymen.

It is all very well to argue that we should not legislate foreign policy in agricultural legislation and, therefore, should not delete South Africa from this bill. Leaving South Africa in the bill is just as certainly legislating foreign policy in an agricultural bill as taking the quota out would be. We cannot escape taking an action which is significant in the foreign policy field, one way or the other.

Under the circumstances, our action should be the right one—not the wrong one.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from the Rules Committee yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has control of the time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute for the purpose of the question.

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

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. My question has nothing to do with the substance of the bill; it has to do only with procedure. Why does the rule provide that the bill come under a closed rule? I have been very hesitant to vote for closed rules. In fact, I do not recall having voted for one, even for bills from the Committee on Ways and Means, because I feel very keenly about the habit of not providing the membership with an opportunity to add to or detract from a bill as it comes before us. Why does this bill come under a closed rule?

Mr. DELANEY. First, there are two types of bills generally that come under a closed rule. There are bills from the Committee on Ways and Means to raise a certain amount of money. If we were to open the bill for amendment, the purpose for which the bill was intended might be defeated.

In regard to this matter, I do not say that all of the amounts contained in the bill were inserted with exact justice. It was a matter of "put on and take off" in the Committee on Agriculture. They struggled for many, many weeks, giving everyone an opportunity to be heard in the Committee on Agriculture where the allocation should be.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to the situation which confronts us at the present time. I understand that a motion will be made at the proper time to vote down the previous question. I urge a vote of "yea" on the previous question, because if the previous question should be defeated, then, under the rules of the House, the Speaker would have the option to recognize whomever he feels is the leading opponent of the proposed legislation. We would have no assurance at all as to whether it would be, then, a completely open rule or what kind of rule would be adopted.

This legislation and this act has worked in the interest of consumers, and I want to tell the Members of the House that if this act is discontinued, come the end of this year the housewives in your districts throughout the United States will have to pay a great deal more for sugar than they do at the present time. The record is clear that the cost of sugar has increased very, very little compared to the increase in the cost-of-living in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a vote of aye for the previous question.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule on this bill, because it is a closed rule.

The closed rule—under which no amendments to the bill can be offered on the floor—is a denial and a denigration of the whole legislative and parliamentary process.

The people at home elect a man as their Representative and send him to Washington; they little think that, under the closed rule procedure when it is invoked, he will, in fact, be substantially helpless and unable to truly represent them.

It flies in the face of every principle of representative government that 435 elected Members of this House should be denied the opportunity to work their will on legislation, through the device of the closed rule adopted in committee by a handful of the membership; a decision exceedingly difficult to reverse, from a practical parliamentary point of view, by action on the floor.

The completely closed rule has little valid excuse even in complicated legislation. Some major amendments could almost always be readily made in order.

In legislation such as we confront here no possible legitimate excuse for a closed rule is at all apparent.

I submit that no one can really defend this procedure. It is simply a case where, by custom and tradition, we become accustomed to, and consequently acquiescent in, a procedure which each one of us would otherwise instinctively and indignantly reject.

The closed rule, in point of fact, is a legislative outrage; and it will take a far more pressing case than an ordinary measure of this kind to persuade me to lend it even reluctant support.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 213, nays 166, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

YEAS—213

Abbitt	Burke, Fla.	Dorn
Abernethy	Burleson, Tex.	Dowdy
Alexander	Burlison, Mo.	Downing
Andrews, Ala.	Byrnes, Wis.	Edmondson
Andrews, N. Dak.	Byron	Evins, Tenn.
Archer	Cabell	Fisher
Arends	Caffery	Flynt
Ashbrook	Camp	Foley
Aspinall	Carter	Ford, Gerald R.
Baker	Casey, Tex.	Fountain
Baring	Cederberg	Fuqua
Belcher	Chamberlain	Galifianakis
Bell	Chappell	Garmatz
Bergland	Clancy	Gettys
Betts	Clawson, Del	Goldwater
Bevill	Collier	Goodling
Blackburn	Collins, Tex.	Griffin
Blanton	Colmer	Gross
Blatnik	Cotter	Gubser
Boggs	Crane	Hagan
Bow	Daniel, Va.	Haley
Bray	Danielson	Hall
Brinkley	Davis, Ga.	Hammer-schmidt
Brooks	Davis, S.C.	Hanna
Brotzman	de la Garza	Hansen, Wash.
Broyhill, N.C.	Delaney	Harsha
Broyhill, Va.	Dellenback	Hébert
Buchanan	Devine	Henderson
	Dickinson	

Hillis	Miller, Ohio	Schmitz
Hogan	Mills, Ark.	Schneebeli
Holifield	Mills, Md.	Scott
Hull	Mink	Sebelius
Hunt	Minshall	Shoup
Hutchinson	Mizell	Shriver
Ichord	Mollohan	Sikes
Jarman	Montgomery	Sisk
Johnson, Calif.	Myers	Skubitz
Johnson, Pa.	Natcher	Slack
Jones, Ala.	Nelsen	Smith, Calif.
Jones, N.C.	Nichols	Snyder
Jones, Tenn.	O'Konski	Spence
Karth	Patman	Staggers
Kazen	Patten	Stanton,
Kee	Perkins	J. William
Keith	Pettis	Steed
Kuykendall	Pickle	Steiger, Ariz.
Kyl	Pirnie	Stubblefield
Landgrebe	Poage	Stuckey
Latta	Poff	Taylor
Leggett	Powell	Teague, Calif.
Lennon	Preyer, N.C.	Thompson, Ga.
Lent	Price, Tex.	Thomson, Wis.
Lloyd	Pryor, Ark.	Thone
Long, La.	Purcell	Ullman
Lujan	Quie	Vander Jagt
McCloskey	Quillen	Waggonner
McClure	Rarick	Wampler
McCollister	Reid, Ill.	White
McEwen	Rhodes	Whitehurst
McFall	Roberts	Whitten
McKay	Robinson, Va.	Widnall
McMillan	Robison, N.Y.	Williams
Mahon	Rogers	Wilson, Bob
Mann	Rooney, N.Y.	Winn
Martin	Rostenkowski	Wright
Mathias, Calif.	Rousselot	Wyatt
Mathis, Ga.	Ruth	Wyman
Matsunaga	Sandman	Young, Fla.
Mazzoli	Satterfield	Young, Tex.
Michel	Saylor	Zion
Miller, Calif.	Scherle	Zwach

NAYS—166

Abourezk	Ford,	Moss
Abzug	William D.	Murphy, Ill.
Adams	Fraser	Murphy, N.Y.
Addabbo	Frelinghuysen	Nedzi
Anderson,	Frenzel	Nix
Calif.	Fulton, Pa.	Obey
Anderson, Ill.	Fulton, Tenn.	O'Hara
Annunzio	Gallagher	O'Neill
Ashley	Gaydos	Pelly
Aspin	Gibbons	Pike
Badillo	Gonzalez	Podell
Barrett	Grasso	Price, Ill.
Begich	Gray	Pucinski
Bennett	Green, Oreg.	Railsback
Biester	Green, Pa.	Randall
Bingham	Gude	Rangel
Boland	Halpern	Reid, N.Y.
Brademas	Hamilton	Reuss
Brasco	Hanley	Riegle
Broomfield	Harrington	Rodino
Brown, Mich.	Harvey	Roe
Burke, Mass.	Hathaway	Roncalio
Burton	Hawkins	Rosenthal
Byrne, Pa.	Hechler, W. Va.	Roush
Carey, N.Y.	Helstoski	Roy
Chisholm	Hicks, Mass.	Roybal
Clay	Hicks, Wash.	Ruppe
Cleveland	Horton	Ryan
Collins, Ill.	Howard	St Germain
Conable	Hungate	Sarbanes
Conte	Jacobs	Scheuer
Corman	Kastenmeier	Schwengel
Daniels, N.J.	Keating	Seiberling
Davis, Wis.	Kemp	Shipley
Dellums	Koch	Smith, Iowa
Dennis	Kyros	Stanton,
Derwinski	Link	James V.
Diggs	Long, Md.	Steele
Dingell	McClory	Steiger, Wis.
Donohue	McDade	Stokes
Dow	McDonald,	Stratton
Drinan	Mich.	Sullivan
Dulski	McKevitt	Terry
Duncan	McKinney	Thompson, N.J.
du Pont	Macdonald,	Udall
Dwyer	Mass.	Van Deerlin
Eckhardt	Madden	Vanik
Edwards, Calif.	Mayne	Vigorito
Eilberg	Meeds	Waldie
Erlenborn	Melcher	Whalen
Esch	Metcalfe	Whalley
Eshleman	Mikva	Wilson,
Evans, Colo.	Minish	Charles H.
Fascell	Mitchell	Wolff
Findley	Monagan	Wylie
Fish	Moorhead	Yates
Flood	Morgan	Yatron
	Mosher	

NOT VOTING—54

Anderson,	Frey	Peyser
Tenn.	Giaimo	Rees
Biaggi	Griffiths	Rooney, Pa.
Bolling	Grover	Runnels
Brown, Ohio	Hansen, Idaho	Smith, N.Y.
Carney	Hastings	Springer
Celler	Hays	Stafford
Clark	Heckler, Mass.	Stephens
Clausen,	Hosmer	Symington
Don H.	Jonas	Talcott
Conyers	King	Teague, Tex.
Coughlin	Kluczynski	Tiernan
Culver	Landrum	Veysey
Denholm	McCormack	Ware
Dent	McCulloch	Watts
Edwards, Ala.	Mailliard	Wiggins
Edwards, La.	Morse	Wydler
Flowers	Passman	Zablocki
Forsythe	Pepper	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Veysey for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Edwards of Alabama for, with Mr. Biaggi against.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana for, with Mr. Dent against.

Mr. Passman for, with Mr. Morse against.

Mr. Stephens for, with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Watts for, with Mr. Stafford against.

Mr. Pepper for, with Mr. Kluczynski against.

Mr. Flowers for, with Mr. Carney against.

Mr. Teague of Texas for, with Mr. Rees against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hays with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Jonas.

Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Forsythe.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. King.

Mr. Conyers with Mr. Symington.

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Ware.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Coughlin.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Denholm with Mr. Frey.

Mr. Runnels with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. McCormack with Mr. Peyser.

Mr. Hosmer with Mr. Wydler.

Mr. Don H. Clausen with Mr. Grover.

Mr. Wiggins with Mr. Hastings.

Messrs. HANLEY, MONAGAN, and KEATING changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8866) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 8866, with Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE) will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BELCHER) will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE).

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

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, the Sugar Act does not come to you every year, as some of you are inclined to think from your recollections. It has been 5 years since this was last before you and if this bill passes it will be 3 years before it will come before us again.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a sugar program since 1935 when we passed the Jones-Costigan Act. Prior to that time, of course, we admitted sugar under a tariff, which simply increased the price of sugar to domestic consumers and gave us no assured supply of sugar. In those earlier years the price of sugar fluctuated tremendously from 1 or 2 cents a pound up to 45 or 50 cents a pound and possibly $1 per pound during World War I. This fluctuation was something which the housewife lived with although she did not like it. In those earlier days the housewife provided the largest market for sugar. Today industrial users take about 75 percent of the sugar.

Industrial users cannot live with the kind of fluctuation which took place prior to the time of our sugar program, and no housewife likes to do it, either. As a matter of fact, the present sugar program has stabilized the price of sugar and stabilized it at a level where the housewife and industrial users are buying their supplies of sugar at a smaller increase than has taken place in any major food commodity now sold in the grocery store. Actually, sugar is bringing about twice at retail what it brought 40 years ago. Almost everything else is bringing four or five times what it brought at that time.

So, whether you understand the sugar program or not—and I am sure most of us do not, and certainly I find it most difficult to understand—whether we understand it or not, it is like the bumblebee—the aerodynamic engineers say that the bumblebee cannot fly, but we find him in the air. There are those who say that the Sugar Act cannot work, but it has stabilized the price of sugar in the United States at reasonable levels for something like 35 years.

Most of the great nations of the world have adopted something comparable to the American program. At least Britain has its sugar program which is very comparable to ours; France has theirs, and now the Common Market. Even the Soviet Union has a sugar program.

In fact, about 92 percent of the world's production is sold under some kind of controlled program comparable to that which we have. The so-called world

market—that which is sold internationally without any program—accounts for only about 8 percent of the sugar produced in the world.

When people look at this "World Market" and think if we could just get sugar as cheaply as it sells for on the world market—which is at this time about half of the American price in the marketplace—they would be making a great saving. However, they fail to realize that the American market accounts for substantially more than the so-called world market and if we destroyed the American market that would affect the world market.

Mr. Chairman, without our American sugar program the price of sugar would unquestionably skyrocket in the United States a way up over where it presently is. It is about 11 cents now. But it would probably sell for 30 or 35 cents for a year or two and then it would probably drop to 2 or 3 cents and stay there a year or two and then move back up. That fluctuation is hurtful to everyone. It is hurtful to the producers of beets and to the producers of sugarcane, but more than that, it is hurtful to every consumer in the United States. Even though I still prefer a sugar bowl on the table we are not consuming sugar directly as we once did. Even so we are all interested in maintaining a degree of price stability for many of our major products on the retail market.

Mr. Chairman, the sugar program has maintained that degree of price stability. How? It has maintained it by feeding into the market predetermined amounts of sugar which in the estimation of the Secretary of Agriculture will just about keep the market stable. Neither the Secretary of Agriculture nor the President nor anyone else can guarantee the exact status of sugar, but we make those estimates every quarter and as a result of those estimates the Secretary of Agriculture has been able to feed into the market just about the amount of sugar which will maintain a generally stable market. In that way he has stabilized the market for the consumers and the price of cane and beets for the producers of this country.

Also, remember that of the 11 million-plus tons of sugar which we consume in the United States about 7 million tons are produced in the United States by cane or beet growers.

Under this bill, as under previous bills, domestic producers are allocated 62 percent of the total production—almost two-thirds of it goes to domestic producers—and that means that the people of the United States have a much greater interest in the production and sale of sugar than do the foreigners about whom you hear so much. The foreigners do not provide but about 37 percent of the total amount of sugar, and that is divided among about 40 countries.

Now, that 62-plus percent which is produced in the United States is divided under the terms of this bill and under the terms of the previous bill so that we have a definite amount of it which is allocated to the beet-sugar producers in the United States—and they are farmers who go all the way from Maine to California and this assures them a reasonable return for their beets—and a certain amount of it is allocated to the cane producers of the continental United States and that means Florida and Louisiana. Of course, those States are the only ones who are producing cane at the present time.

The State of Hawaii is allocated about 1 million tons. That is, about one-seventh of the total sugar produced in the United States comes from the State of Hawaii. Almost the same amount is allocated to Puerto Rico, but Puerto Rico has not been able to meet its quotas in recent years, and probably will not in the future. But where they had a deficit of some 800,000 tons, we only transferred 300,000 tons of it to the mainland cane areas.

The bill then provides an addition to the allocation of sugar to these domestic areas, from the growth—and there is a substantial growth in consumption from year to year. It provides that from the growth during the next 3 years that there shall be 100,000 tons of the production reserved for cane growers in new areas. That means outside of Louisiana and Florida. For practical purposes it means Texas, Arizona, and California. If anybody else can grow it, why, they are just as much entitled to it as those States. But we think that is the practical meaning of that provision.

The bill also provides the allocation of 100,000 tons for the beet growers in continental United States. Right now anybody in the United States who wants to grow beets can do so because we actually are not getting as many beets produced as the present allocations would allow, so there is no actual limitation of production of beets at the present time other than the economic limitations which exist in the purchasing of beets, and those economic factors would still remain.

But there would be new acreage available in the beet areas under the terms of this bill for anybody who can get a processing plant to build in their area.

Now, I am not going to tell you that all the big beet-processing companies are going to run out and try to build a plant in your back yard, because I do not think they will. On the contrary, I think probably some of the existing processing plants are going to close in the next few years. Probably if we raise the price they might stay open but, stabilizing prices as we have, we are giving to the consumers a price that is low enough that it is causing some of the beet processors to go out of business.

But the door is open under the terms of this bill for an expansion both of cane and of beet production in the continental United States.

The next part of the bill relates to the foreign producers. There are about 40 countries which share in the American sugar quotas abroad. And you should bear in mind that when the sugar program was originated some 97 percent of all of our foreign supplies came from Cuba.

The Philippines were then a part of the United States. We are now not getting any sugar from Cuba, but Cuba still has a quota. Some of you may wonder about that. Under the existing law the Cuban quota is 1.5 million tons. This bill reduces that to 750,000 tons.

The President has the power under the present law and under this bill to suspend the quotas of any country where he feels it is in the interest of the United States. He has consistently suspended the Cuban quotas since the Communist takeover there, and we of course anticipate that it will be suspended in the future.

Now this bill does allocate 750,000 tons of what has been Cuban quota to the various foreign countries on a percentage basis as a permanent quota. This does not have any effect whatever on the actual amount of sugar those foreign countries get. They have been getting this from the Cuban quota, but they received it as a temporary quota issued year by year by the State Department.

We felt that by giving them a larger permanent quota from the 750,000 tons now a part of the Cuban quota that they would be in the better position to finance the construction of needed processing and shipping facilities in those foreign countries. Hence we have made half of the existing Cuban quota permanent rather than a temporary quota for the foreign countries. That has changed to some extent the quota of each and every foreign country.

Another factor that has changed the actual amount that these foreign countries were getting, at least the amount of most of the foreign countries, was the allocation of the Puerto Rican deficit. I pointed out that Puerto Rico lacked nearly 800,000 tons of meeting her quota, and that amount is allocated to the foreign countries. Some of you might immediately raise the question, "Why do you not allocate that to the American producers?" We had that presented to us and it is a logical and reasonable question. The reason we did not allocate that to the American producer is that we must have the full amount of sugar needed if the program is going to work. If you need 800,000 tons of sugar brought into the country from Puerto Rico to supply the amounts that the Secretary estimated will be needed during that year, and you find some portion or all of that amount is not going to be supplied, then you must allocate that deficit to countries which actually have sugar on hand. We do not in the United States produce sugar in excess of what we can sell—or if we do, it is just an insignificant amount. But most of these countries from which we are receiving quota sugar have a vast amount of sugar on hand, and we have to allocate the deficit to somebody who has the sugar on hand and can help out at once—in that quarter of the year. That is why we allocate the domestic deficit to foreigners rather than to American producers—because the American producer could not produce it until next year, and to do that he would have to make changes in all of his production plans. On the other hand foreigners or at least many of the foreign countries have sugar in storage and can ship at once, thus maintaining the unin-

terrupted flow of sugar as it is needed to maintain our needed supply.

That raises the question which I want to discuss right now in connection with the item which was so completely discussed a few moments ago. Why do we give a quota to certain nations—specifically, South Africa? Basically this program will not work unless you have your quotas assigned in large part, at least, to nations which can supply and will supply the amount of sugar which you allocate to them.

I recognize there are two conflicting purposes to be achieved by the sugar program, both of which are actually used by all of us whether we recognize it or not. We try to take care of the United States, and I think that is the fundamental purpose of the sugar bill. We seek to make this as helpful as we can to our neighbors, and I think it is proper that we should, so far as we can do so without hurting our own national interests.

Your committee has given to black countries around South Africa 105,000 tons of sugar. Keep that in mind—105,000 tons of sugar—to five black neighbors of South Africa. We give South Africa itself 60,000 tons—not much more than half of what we give her black neighbors. But here is the difference—the allocation to the neighbors was made primarily, at least in very large part, for the purpose of helping those countries and for the purpose of moving these developing countries as far as we can in the course of their development. Your committee has surely not been hostile to giving quotas to the black countries because we voted 105,000 tons to those neighboring countries of South Africa, and we just kept the South African quota where it has been for a great many years, at 60,000 tons.

I do not believe that anyone can fairly say that we showed any bias against the native States of Africa when we gave them that much more sugar than we gave South Africa. But we gave that quota to them primarily to help those black countries. We gave 60,000 tons to South Africa primarily to help the United States. We did not give anything to South Africa to develop that great country. It has a great economy which, as some have said, is, in some respects, even more prosperous than the United States. We were not passing anything out to South Africa in the way of charity. But of all the countries in the world, South Africa probably has indicated a greater determination to provide the United States with all the sugar that we sought to receive from them than any other country in the world.

I say that because, when that country was afflicted with a terrible drought a few years ago, they still shipped to the United States every ton of sugar that the bill provided for. They shipped so much from South Africa that they later had to go into the market to buy sugar to supply their own needs at home. But they took care of the United States, and their opportunities to trade with the United States, regardless of what happened to the price of sugar in South Africa. I doubt that you can point to another illustration of a nation doing that sort of thing.

To me, that indicates that we have a dependable source of supply there. Since that great drought they have built at Durban some of the most modern and efficient processing and shipping facilities in the world today, so that we have an assured supply of sugar there, certainly far different from the supply in the surrounding black countries, which is largely a hope rather than a reality.

So I think the Members should understand that the committee did not simply act capriciously nor did we act because we were either for or against the domestic policies of South Africa or of any other country. Some of the countries of Africa have restrictions against white people. We consider all of these matters to come under the head of "their business." As was very well explained here within the last hour's debate, this committee does not believe that its function is to determine what kind of domestic government or what the rules may be in regard to domestic affairs in the countries from which we are receiving sugar. We are buying sugar from some of the most powerful dictatorships in the world today. We say we do not want dictatorships. No, I do not want them here. But I do not think it is my affair if somebody else has that form of government, if that is what they want. We are buying sugar from princes and potentates. We are buying sugar from the humble and the great. We are buying sugar where it seems to be in the interest of the United States to buy it, and I think that is a sound rule and it is one which the committee has followed and, I hope, continues to follow.

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

Mr. POAGE. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, the total tonnage of sugar involved in this bill and in the American supply is greater than 11 million tons. The South African contribution is 60,000 tons out of 11 million tons. So I would ask you whether the South African percentage, which is less than 1 percent, is crucial to the existence of the American economy.

Mr. POAGE. Of course, it is nit-picking, but that is not the percentage. It is not 11 million tons. We only get about 4 million tons from foreign sources, and it is a percentage of 4 million rather than a percentage of 11 million. So the gentleman has it nearly three times out of whack.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, I was speaking of our entire sugar economy, which I think is greater than 11 million tons.

Mr. POAGE. The sugar economy depends almost two-thirds upon domestic sugar. When we speak about the one-third which come from abroad, the South African quota is 60,000 tons out of 4 million tons, rather than out of 11 million tons.

Mr. DOW. But it is less than 1 percent of the sugar consumed in the American economy.

Mr. POAGE. I understand the point the gentleman is making. Since this is not a great quantity percentagewise of the total amount of sugar consumed, we ought not to be bothering about it. I would be willing to go along with the gentleman if he would be willing to go along with his own philosophy. The South African quota is not a big quota.

It seems to me, following that line of reasoning, it is utterly ridiculous to get up here and make a great fight about it. What difference does it make? One percent, as the gentleman says, is all it is. The gentleman is disturbing this House about 1 percent, a minor affair.

To the gentleman it is a matter of principle, and the gentleman feels it is important. I feel it is important that we maintain some degree of responsibility to American consumers, whether it comes from a nation producing 1 percent, one-tenth of 1 percent, or 10 percent.

If we followed that philosophy we would eliminate any consideration of most of the countries of the world, because there are not very many countries that are great suppliers. There are about five that have fairly large quotas, and that is all. If the gentleman suggests the rest of them are not important, then we do not need even to consider about 35 of the 40 countries that are getting sugar quotas.

It seems very clear to me, if the gentleman will just apply his philosophy to his own reasoning, he would never offer an amendment in regard to the South African quota to take up the time of this House, because it is such a minor item as he points out.

For the information of the Members of the House, I should like to have the Members understand just what has been done as to these quotas. They will not suit every Member and I am sure that every Member would write some of them differently. I would. I do not like some of the items but I believe we have come as close as we can to pleasing everyone as it will be possible to do. I, therefore, support the entire allocation.

We have added sugar to the quota of the Argentine, in the amount of 4,000 tons. As the gentleman from New York says, it is not a tremendous amount, but it is right important to those people.

We have added to the quota of the Bahamas, which are probably, next to Mexico, the closest source of supply to the United States, 23,000 tons.

For Bolivia we have added 9,700 tons.

For British Honduras, just across the Gulf of Mexico from us, we have added 18,000 tons.

For Colombia we have added 11,000 tons.

For Honduras we have added 9,700 tons.

For the Malagasy Republic we have added 5,300 tons.

For Malawi we have added 15,000 tons—which is entirely new.

For Mauritius the addition is 11,000 tons.

For Panama it is 20,000 tons.

For Paraguay it is 15,000 tons.

For Swaziland, a black republic adjoining South Africa, it is 22,600 tons.

For Uganda, another black republic, it is 15,000 tons.

For Venezuela it is 7,000 tons.

When you add to anyone's quota you must take away from someone else.

We have taken from a number of countries in proportion to the amount that they were supplying. Basically these are the five large suppliers; that is, the Philippine Islands, Mexico, the Dominican Republic, Brazil, and Peru. We have taken from those countries at the same ratio, which means about 9 percent from each of the countries.

We have canceled the quota of the French West Indies, which was 62,000 tons. The reason for doing this was that the French West Indies have been made a part of the Common Market as a part of the Republic of France. They are a department in France just exactly like the States of Hawaii and Alaska are parts of the United States. They vote on delegates to the French Parliament. They have a quota in the Common Market which they supply, and they supplied the quota to the United States only after they had supplied the Common Market quota. We felt under those circumstances there was no justification for continuing that quota, and that has been eliminated.

Most of the other quotas have been changed in a very minor way as a result of the shift of the Cuban quota and of the Puerto Rican deficit. Those have resulted in minor shifts, but with no major shift anywhere.

In addition to the quota system, our sugar program also contains a tax program and a subsidy payment to domestic producers. All sugar sells on the market at substantially the same price in competition with all other sugar, but the domestic producer receives a payment in proportion to the amount of sugar he produces. This payment is financed out of the sugar tax which both foreign and domestic producers pay. But the tax is substantially more than the total amount of the payments. Over the life of the program, the Treasury of the United States has received something like $600 million more than it has paid out.

Therefore, this program is remarkable in that it costs the Government nothing and actually pays a profit into the Treasury. The bill makes no change in the tax or the payment provisions; they continue just as they have in the past. They have worked well and we believe they will continue to work.

Indeed the entire bill is substantially what we have been providing for a good many years. It will do, as we believe, what it has been doing—maintain a stable price and a fair price for sugar. We hope it will be adopted.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Puerto Rico, the Resident Commissioner (Mr. CÓRDOVA).

Mr. CÓRDOVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill. The sugar industry, while no longer the dominant factor in the economy of Puerto Rico, is still a very important factor. Our sugar production has declined substantially in recent years, but our government is committed to an extraordinary effort to help our growers bring back production through improved methods, and to this end is providing over $100 million, over a 5-year period, to assist the growers in mechanizing their operations and otherwise improving their practices. The success of this joint effort of the farmer and the government requires assurance of a market at a reasonable price. The bill before you today provides our farmers with the necessary assurances in this respect. The consumer will not be hurt. The sugar program which has been in force for over 35 years, and which the bill before you would extend with slight modifications, has protected the consumer as well as the farmer, to the extent that the price of sugar in our country has been maintained at a stable level, below that of such countries as Japan, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Sweden.

I ask for your support, in the conviction that this piece of legislation will redound to the benefit, not only of Puerto Rico, but of all our domestic beet and cane growers, as well as the consumer.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE).

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture, for the time which he has yielded to me.

I also wish to commend the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE), and our good friend from Puerto Rico (Mr. CÓRDOVA), on the fine presentations they have made.

Under the committee bill the tiny countries of British Honduras—population 120,000—and the Bahamas—population 195,000 are awarded tremendous increases in their quotas while eight of their much larger Central American and Caribbean neighbors are required to take substantial cuts. The favoritism shown these two countries represents a striking departure from the criteria which the committee was to apply in assignment of foreign quotas. Their increases are so disproportionate when compared with their neighbors as to raise serious doubts that they could have been reached on any reasonably nondiscriminatory basis.

It has long been recognized that one of the great pitfalls in the Sugar Act lies in its provision for assignment of sugar quotas to individual foreign countries by the Congress. The distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee, the Honorable W. R. POAGE, is to be commended for establishing ground rules this year which he hoped would promote fairness in determining foreign eligibility for quota increases or decreases. On March 4, 1971, he wrote to all registered foreign lobbyists and agents prescribing five criteria which presumably were to be applied uniformly to all countries in the allocation process. These criteria were implicit in the mandate given the subcommittee appointed to recommend specific foreign allocations. With some 39 countries involved, it is easy to understand how some of these criteria could be discounted or overlooked as the subcommittee struggled with so many applications. This, however, does not relieve this Member of his responsibility to inform the members of the committee and the House when he believes there has been an unreasonable and unwise abandonment of the criteria. This seems to me to be the case with British Honduras and the Bahamas, both of which are eligible for participation in the British Commonwealth's preferential sugar market. The sugar factories in each are owned by private foreign companies, British in the case of British Honduras; American in the case of the Bahamas.

The remarkable extent to which the committee bill unfairly favors these two countries over their neighbors is evident from the following table:

Country	Population	Old basic quota (1965 act)	Old total quota and prorations	New total quota and prorations	Increase or decrease	Per capita income
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Bahamas	195,000	(T)10,000	(T)10,000	(T)33,173	(T)23,173	$1,500
British Honduras	120,000	6,850	14,539	33,173	18,634	400
British West Indies	3,800,000	94,032	199,579	189,926	−9,653	505
Costa Rica	1,695,000	27,711	67,728	64,607	−3,121	466
Dominican Republic	4,174,000	235,390	575,312	519,909	−55,403	305
El Salvador	3,390,000	17,125	41,852	39,924	−1,928	283
Guatemala	5,014,000	23,352	57,074	54,445	−2,629	314
Haiti	4,768,000	13,077	31,962	30,489	−1,473	80
Honduras	2,495,000	2,802	6,850	16,612	9,762	246
Mexico	48,313,438	240,684	588,249	531,603	−56,646	572
Nicaragua	1,915,000	27,711	67,728	64,607	−3,121	387
Panama	1,417,000	17,437	42,616	62,947	20,331	624

British Honduras, which had a basic quota of only 6,850 tons under the 1965 act, will now be guaranteed a new total quota and prorations of 33,173 tons, a fivefold increase. When prorations were added, it of course actually shipped 14,539 tons to the United States in 1971, but even this figure is being upped by 18,634 tons per year. The increase for the Bahamas is even more generous. Its total 1971 quota and prorations figure of 10,000 tons is jumped a whopping 23,173 to 33,173 tons.

In contrast, the following countries with much larger populations will be cut substantially below their 1971 total quota and prorations as follows:

British West Indies	−9,653
Costa Rica	−3,121
Dominican Republic	−55,403
El Salvador	−1,928
Guatemala	−2,629
Haiti	−1,473
Mexico	−56,646
Nicaragua	−3,121

Why should the sugar interests in British Honduras and the Bahamas be accorded this very special treatment? I have yet to hear any reasonable justification for it after hearing the testimony of their lobbyists and being present when the subcommittee's allocations were presented to and considered by the full committee.

First as to British Honduras, it is a British colony whose sugar industry has for many years enjoyed the protective subsidies of the British Commonwealth's preferential sugar agreement. It has only two sugar factories which are entirely British owned by Belize Sugar Industries, Ltd., the mother company being Tate & Lyle of England.

Mr. Arthur L. Quinn, a registered agent and spokesman for Belize Sugar Industries, Ltd., testified that the total 1970 sugar production of his company—and of all British Honduras—was 77,193 short tons. This was disposed of as follows: 15,758 to the United States at $136.75 per ton—6.8 cents per pound—this amounts to $2,154,906; 23,692 to the United Kingdom at $99.26 per ton under the preferential Commonwealth agreement—5 cents per pound; 27,194 to Canada at $80.38 under an international sugar agreement—4 cents per pound; 2,800 consumed locally; 7,687 surplus.

The world price in 1970 was only $75 per ton or 3.8 cents per pound.

It is evident this country very substantially "shares in other premium markets such as the United Kingdom," which was one of the factors prescribed by Chairman POAGE as diminishing the need for a premium priced market in the United States—the fourth criterion.

Mr. Quinn contended that the company actually incurred losses of $48,000 on its 1970 sales to the United Kingdom. If this is true, which seems highly unlikely. then the company must have incurred even greater losses on larger sales to Canada at a much lower price. Obviously this British company operating in a British colony would not have been able to furnish sugar to the United Kingdom at $99.26 per ton and to Canada at $80.38 if it were not receiving more than $2,150,000 from the American consumer at the artificial quota price of $136.75 per ton. The company's large profits from American consumers enabled it to give the United Kingdom and Canada a much better deal. This means that the American housewife is in effect being forced to subsidize sugar prices throughout the British Commonwealth system which still means throughout the world.

The American largess to be paid Belize Sugar Industries, Ltd., in British Honduras, will now increase greatly if the committee bill becomes law. Projecting the 1970 figure of 15,758 tons supplied by Mr. Quinn to the new annual figure of 33,173, the total American payments will jump from $2,154,906 to $4,536,407, an increase of $2,381,501.

British Honduras also fails to qualify for preferential treatment over its neighbors upon a comparison of present stages of and need for economic development—criterion 4(c). Its per capita income of $400 is greater than that of the Dominican Republic, $305; El Salvador, $283; Guatemala, $314; Haiti, $80; Honduras, $246; and Nicaragua, $387.

Nor has a case been made that British Honduras is entitled to special consideration over its neighbors by reason of greater sharing by factories and larger landowners with farmers and workers—criterion No. 5.

The two sugar factories are owned outright by British stockholders with no local participation; 60 percent of the sugarcane is grown by 2,300 independent cane farmers. While Mr. Quinn testified that negotiations are underway between the British Honduras Government and the company to transfer the latter's cane lands to nationals, the fact remains that 40 percent of the country's sugar cane continues to be grown by the company on its own land.

The more than threefold increase which the committee bill gives to the Bahamas is similarly indefensible. Here the entire increase of 23,173 tons—approximately $3,168,000—will go to a U.S. corporation which has found the production of sugar in the Bahamas highly unprofitable. Owens-Illinois, Inc., of Toledo, Ohio, is the sole owner of the only sugar mill and all sugar-producing land in the Bahamas.

Sugar production did not commence in the Bahamas until 1969. The company lost $6,700,000 in 1969 and $3,000,000 in 1970. It is not harvesting in the 1970–71 season but preserving the growing cane for possible harvesting next year.

The company's representative testified:

> Having lost $6,700,000 in 1969 and $3,000,000 in 1970, we thought it would be economic folly to harvest the 1971 crop without assurance of a substantially increased market for sugar in the United States since out of pocket cost of harvesting and milling would exceed indicated return from any raw sugar sold on the world market.

Now, the 23,173 tons boost for the Bahamas was defended in the committee on the grounds of friendship and proximity to the United States. However, the Bahamas are neither friendlier nor closer to us than Mexico, which is being told that it must take a cut of 56,646 tons.

The table set forth above shows that many other good friends of the United States are being cut or given much smaller increases.

A case was also perhaps made that the increased quota to the Bahamas will greatly enhance the chance Owens-Illinois, Inc., has of finding a buyer on suitable terms.

It is no doubt true that adding more than $3 million per year to the company's revenues from sales to American consumers will strengthen the company's financial position substantially.

But this Congress has of late been exhibiting a certain reluctance to bail even American corporations out of unprofitable financial situations.

The large Bahaman increase clearly does not meet the second criterion set forth by Chairman POAGE, to wit: dependability as a source of supply as reflected by the country's history in supplying the U.S. market.

Sugar production did not even commence in the Bahamas until 1969, lasted only 2 years and was suspended in 1971. The fact that annual production has never exceeded 13,600 tons gives little assurance that the Bahamas can meet its new quota and prorations of 33,173 tons.

Nor does the Bahamas qualify for a greatly increased quota when its present stage of and need for economic development is compared with that of its neighbors, under criterion No. 4.

Did you know the Bahamas have the largest per capita income of any country in the Caribbean or in Central America—$1,500 per capita? There is in fact no country anywhere in all Latin America which even approaches that figure.

The closest one to it on the foregoing table is $624 per capita for Panama and the others range way down to $80 per capita. So it certainly cannot be said the Bahamas has a greater need for economic development than the others, or that its present state of economic development lags behind theirs.

I supported in committee an amendment which would have decreased the British Honduras' proposed increase by 9,762 tons, but would still give it an increase of 8,872 tons.

I also appeared before the Committee on Rules yesterday and asked for an open rule or for a modified rule which would make it possible for me to offer such an amendment again here and a similar one to reduce the Bahamas increase by a similar amount. This would have left the Bahamas with an increase of 13,411 tons, still much larger than any of its neighbors except Panama. Unfortunately, the action of the Committee on Rules in voting a closed rule and the acceptance of such a rule by the House makes it impossible for me to offer such an amendment today. I regret that the Members will therefore not have an opportunity to vote to reduce the overgenerous and ill-advised increases in quotas for these two countries to more reasonable amounts. Under the circumstances I believe I have no choice but to urge my colleagues to join me in voting "no" on final passage.

The committee bill will continue and aggravate a system which forces American consumers to pay high subsidies to foreign sugar producers under a quota system. It is unfair to the American housewife by requiring her to buy foreign sugar at a premium almost double the world market price, thereby subsidizing sugar prices not only in the British Commonwealth but throughout the world. The system is unfair to the American producer in that it gives the same price he receives to foreign competitors whose labor and other costs are vastly lower. Congressman PAUL FINDLEY, a member of the committee, testified the injustice in the present pricing system is apparent when one recognizes that no foreign producer faces cost items as high as those which confront U.S. producers, yet each gets the advantage of a price based on U.S. costs.

For example, wages as little as $1.50 or $2 a day are still commonplace among foreign suppliers; $4 a day is big money. Contrast these with almost $35 a day paid to workers in Hawaii and $1.85 an hour in the sugar beet areas of the United States. Despite these wage differentials, foreign suppliers get almost the same price in the U.S. market as domestic producers.

The American consumer deserves a better price on sugar supplied by foreign countries. I agree with Mr. FINDLEY'S statement that—

Under the present arrangement the American people get hooked, and bad.

The committee bill is also unfair to foreign producers in that it increases the inequities of the present foreign quota system, the most conspicuous examples of which are the amazing increases now given British Honduras and the Bahamas. The bill in its present form should be defeated.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG).

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, during the past year, the beet sugar industry of the United States observed its 100th anniversary, recalling that the first successful beet sugar factory in this Nation began operations in 1870 in a small California town bordering San Francisco Bay.

Thirty-two years earlier, however, our own Michigan pioneers had made the effort to start sugar production at White Pigeon. That was in 1838. Unfortunately, the enthusiasm of the entrepreneurs who undertook that enterprise was not matched by the necessary technical skills to assure success. Thus it evolved that the White Pigeon plant failed and our first successful sugar operations in Michigan did not prove out until 1898 when a beet sugar plant was successful in my native Bay City.

Today, Michigan is a major contributor to our Nation's sugar production, producing annually in the range of 350 million pounds of beet sugar from about 90,000 acres of our fine farmland.

As a spokesman for our Michigan sugar industry, I strongly endorse passage of the sugar legislation now under consideration by this body. The Sugar Act of 1948, as amended on several prior occasions, has served the producers and the consumers of Michigan well. Indeed, so it has all American sugar producers and consumers. It has been a tremendously effective and desirable instrument of national policy and certainly there is nothing in its long record to suggest it now receive other than our most determined support.

There are a number of more or less technical adjustments to our national sugar program embodied in the current legislation. These bear the general support of all segments of our domestic sugar industry and have been brought to our attention by the Committee on Agriculture only after extended, though wise and dedicated, study and effort on the part of the gentleman who comprise that committee.

The full record considered, I think the legislation now before us deserves our endorsement and approval. Further, I wish to join those of my colleagues who have earlier today expressed supporting views similar to mine and to commend each of them for the stand they have taken.

In a word, Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my esteemed colleagues to approve H.R. 8866 and thus to assure the further extension of a wholly beneficial program which has served, and will continue to serve, our national interest in a most effective fashion.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ZWACH).

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the extension of the Sugar Act.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SEBELIUS).

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with those who have today urged passage of H.R. 8866.

Many fine sugar beets are grown and processed in western Kansas. We have seen firsthand the economic benefits accruing from the growing and processing of sugar.

The bill before us today continues a program that has proven itself over the past 37 years and has worked to the benefit of consumers as well as producers. I wish to briefly address myself to those consumer benefits.

Certainly, one of the outstanding features of our sugar program is the price stability it has brought to the domestic market. Industrial users of sugar who support the major provisions of this bill need not carry excessive stocks of sugar as a hedge against sudden large price increases. Nor do they fear the value of the stocks on hand will drop suddenly. Thus, they can budget ahead for raw material with confidence. The retail consumer who buys sugar in grocery packages also is secure in the knowledge that sugar will be available when she needs it, and at a minor cost to her budget.

By any fair standard of measurement, the price of sugar is reasonable. If one were to divide the countries of the world into two groups, it might be done on the basis of those who were net importers of sugar and those who were net exporters of sugar. A comparison of retail sugar prices in the United States are about equal to the average for the other net importing countries, which often are highly developed nations. The average price of sugar in net exporting countries, as might be expected, is a little lower.

To take a few representative sugar prices from developed nations, compiled by the International Sugar Council in London for the year 1968, the United States price was 12.2 cents per pound. That of Japan was 16.1 cents; Italy 17.1; the United Kingdom, 8.5; Netherlands, 15.6; Canada, 8.9; Belgium, 15.5; and Australia, 11.7.

Although inflation has affected the sugar industry, as it has all other segments of the American economy, the price of sugar has not changed as rapidly as most other items purchased by the average citizen. For example, in 1969, the index of the retail price of all foods was 125 percent of the 1957–59 average, while the retail price of sugar at 12.4 cents per pound was only 111 percent of the 1957–1959 average price of 11.2 cents per pound. In comparison to the price of all foods and of disposable income, sugar is cheaper today than it was when the sugar program was started in 1937. Deflated for changes in the price of all foods, sugar averaged 4.67 cents per pound during the base period 1935–1939, and 4.23 cents per pound in 1970. Deflated for changes in personal income, sugar averaged 4.67 cents per pound during the base period and 1.8 cents per pound in 1970.

In relation to the rest of the American economy, the price of sugar has posted an admirable performance, and our Sugar Act has been the tool with which we accomplished this. Passage of H.R. 8866 will allow us to maintain this record for American consumers.

Likewise, an assured market at a price that will enable the farmer to sell his product at a profit is highly desirable. The sugar program has worked for the benefit of the producer and the consumer and that is why we have the program. When something is working for the purpose intended, then it should be continued. That is why I urge the passage of H.R. 8866.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HUNGATE). The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, it is very seldom the Committee on Agriculture comes before the House that they do not want to spend some of the taxpayers' money. This is a different bill. This bill paid $658 million into the Treasury of the United States since it was enacted in 1934. It keeps the price of the sugar to the housewife and the industrial users down. It makes it possible for the growers in this country to make a profit. I believe this is the only bill I have ever supported that does all these three things.

I am for the sugar bill. I have been for it for the last 20 years. I think it is the best legislation I have ever had the opportunity to bring before the House.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE) and two others voted against the bill in the committee. Thirty Members voted for it. The gentleman went before the Rules Committee and tried to get an open rule, which would have ruined the entire bill. He spoke 14 minutes today. I guess he wants to kill the entire bill.

There are 25 countries involved in the foreign quota. There are 11,200,000 tons involved. The gentleman complained about 18,000 tons and 20,000 tons for two small countries, and he was willing to scuttle the entire bill in order to get back at those two little countries. I do not know what he has against those two countries.

I am on the subcommittee that brought out the suggestion of these foreign quotas I looked them over very carefully. I did not go along with all of them. I thought some of them might have been raised a little more than they were and some of them ought to have been cut more than they were. But when you have a bill to consider that is as involved as this bill is, you have to spend a great deal of time on it. I spent 3 months with the State Department, the administration, and the Department of Agriculture getting an agreement on the bill with 30 Members of the House. I was willing to go along on some of these little things that I did not like.

The gentleman from Iowa has the priv-

ilege of voting any way he wants to on any bill. If he wants to kill the entire sugar bill because he wants to get back at two little countries, that is his business, and I do not quarrel with him. I have never told anybody in this House how he or she ought to vote on any single bill. I am not going to tell him how to vote on this single bill.

But these little countries must be very important to the gentleman if he wants to sacrifice the price of sugar to all of his constituents. I am for the sugar bill. I hope it passes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Dow).

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DOW. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, the attendance today is a good example of the futility of a closed rule. There are no more Members present today than there might be at the ordinary time for special orders. Yet we are considering one of the major bills of the session, a bill involving $1.5 billion. There are a great many serious questions about the proper usage of that money. Yet here we are, a handful, a corporal's guard, sitting around in a major debate on a sugar bill that will operate for 3 years in the field of this great product, the sugar economy of the United States.

I oppose the amendment to section 408 of the Sugar Act of 1948 which grants the President discretion to withhold a portion of, as well as the entire quota, of a nation seizing ownership or control of property of U.S. citizens without adequate settlement. This objectionable amendment further carries a provision that largely embodies the "Grace Amendment" which was intended to fortify W. R. Grace & Co. in a claim against Peru going back to 1969.

I have been accused of being a "bleeding heart" because I am concerned about the status of the Bantu in South Africa, but I submit that the gentlemen who wrote this bill are "bleeding hearts" also, every one of them. It is true they are not concerned about the Bantu or the condition of labor in South Africa. They are not concerned about the migrant workers, because they rejected a provision on that score, but their hearts are bleeding for W. R. Grace & Co. and these economic royalists who are trying to grind down the people in the remote parts of the underdeveloped world.

Now, this new provision to which I object establishes a new account in the U.S. Treasury to pay claims of U.S. citizens arising out of similar seizure or control of property of U.S. citizens done without adequate settlement. The Treasury account would be financed by a $20 per-ton impost upon the nation involved, at the discretion of the President.

This entire amendment with its new provision deserves special attention because it highlights so sharply the wide gulf of misunderstanding that has been generated in the United States vis-a-vis the underdeveloped nations of the world.

The prevailing attitude in our country today is blind to the problems of the underdeveloped nations. To put it bluntly, those nations, owing to grim necessities of their own, are obliged to play the economic game in a new way. And, saddest of all, we are largely unaware that the game today is different. For we are continuing to play the old game that suited us in years gone by.

In this period of history, the underdeveloped nations, many of them only recently freed from colonial domination, are uniformly and universally seeking to assert their national integrity and independence. They want to pull themselves up by their bootstraps in the world economy. They are wracked by the violence of their own efforts to overthrow economic royalists, both foreign and domestic.

In the conduct of their evolution and revolution, these many underdeveloped nations are resorting to devices of expropriation and possibly property seizure under terms of compensation that offend our ingrained sense of property rights.

On second thought, however, if we were to examine closely the game that those nations have to play, we would see, by and large, that each one has very few chips on the table. Each nation has but one or two products available with which to exert the leverage that will help it rise. For example, the Equadorians have little besides their bananas and coffee. The Bolivians have tin; the Chileans, copper; the Colombians, coffee; and the Peruvians offer fishmeal. Their tactic must be to reassert their control over these unique and vital products by sovereign acts. Unfortunately, their methods do not always accord with property concepts as constituted under our system.

Meanwhile the United States continues the property game under the old rules which were conceived in a Victorian century. It seems to me that we will have to learn that we cannot enforce upon little sovereignties in our own hemisphere and around the world the same property rights by which we hold to account a defaulter on Locust Street in our hometown.

This is the overriding consideration for our international relations in this immediate period. It is the lesson we did not understand in Vietnam. If, after losing 45,000 dead, we still do not understand the new world from the Vietnam experience, then indeed the future of our own nation is in serious jeopardy. For we will be at loggerheads with more and more of the emergent peoples struggling to reassert their authority over affairs in their respective lands.

For this tremendous reason I submit that the efforts to impose niggling, parsonic penalties, like $20 a ton on sugar, against those nationalities who are struggling to get up in the world is worse than petty. It is blind, to say the least, also self-deluding, and downright dangerous as a future policy for this nation.

I would have offered an amendment to limit producer payments, just as we do for staple grains.

Anyone who attended the recent hearings on the Sugar Act of 1971 could properly form the impression that the entire sugar business of the United States, which comes to about $1.8 billion, is wrapped up in a tidy package that gives all of those involved—producers, processors, manufacturers, and importers—an equitable share, but may not wholly serve the interests of the consuming public. In fact, a reading of the extravagant fees paid to sugar lobbyists, which is listed on p. 1133 of the May 21, 1971 issue of the Congressional Quarterly, raises questions such as, how much more do we not know about sugar.

The voice of the consumer is barely heard in the "Land of Sugar". In the recent hearings before the House Committee on Agriculture, among those who testified, there was but one consumer witness. Any reading of the testimony will show that his reception at the hands of the Committee was the least cordial of any throughout the length of the hearings. Accordingly, it seems quite in order to limit the take of the sugar consortium, just as a matter of sensible business and good principle, to something less than their gross demands. This is the justification for the amendment that I would offer, if permitted, so as to limit producer payments.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to call attention to the statement made by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Dow), that there was only one consumer witness who appeared before the committee. We were in session for about 3 months and invited any and every person who wanted to be heard to be heard. Not one was turned away. We heard every witness, consumer or otherwise, who offered to be heard. We heard the gentleman from New York and we heard every consumer he asked us to hear. If someone was not heard, it was his fault and not that of the committee. I am disappointed that the gentleman should feel impelled to imply that the committee denied anyone an opportunity to appear

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. We had a man before the committee on two different occasions who represented 75 percent of the sugar purchased in the whole United States. He was a representative of the consumers.

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

Mr. POAGE. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOW. He is what I would call an intermediate consumer. I am talking about people like you and me that put sugar in our coffee. We are the ones I am worrying about.

Mr. POAGE. The point I am making is the committee gave everyone, like you and me, an opportunity to be heard, and if they were not heard, it was their fault and not that of the committee. I note that the gentleman is at a loss to name one witness who asked an opporutnity to testify and who was refused that opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8866 which will extend the Sugar Act for 3 years. I regret that the extension could not be for a longer period because the scope of this legislation is such that it arouses debates on extraneous points which do not deal with the essentials nor with the basic necessity of a system of quotas, as a protection to the American consumer as well as the sugar industry itself. First of all we do not produce enough sugar within our own country to meet the demand. We are therefore required to buy from foreign producers. If we were to buy freely from the world market, the importation of low-cost sugar would price out all of the domestic sugar grown in the United States with the consequent result of many growers being forced to farm some other more economic commodity instead of sugar. This would then eventually reduce our own domestic production to a point where we would be largely dependent upon foreign sugar production, without protection of either source nor price to be paid by our consumers. Many economists who have studied this picture argue that the final result would be an increase in the price of sugar to the American housewife.

The points therefore which should be made are that sugar is an essential food, that we do not produce enough to supply our domestic needs, that we must buy a certain percentage in the foreign market, and that the price paid to foreign growers must be the same as that paid for our own domestically produced sugar. Because of the latter point, who gets to sell their sugar to the U.S. consumer at twice the world market price becomes a matter of so-called patronage, friendly relations, and diplomatic policy. Without any doubt, this part of the quota system can never escape debate and disagreement for each of us has his own notion as to how this market should or could be best divided among our foreign friends and political allies. A discussion of the Sugar Act therefore must always contain heated and lively debate concerning foreign policy, unless the Congress is willing to relinquish this responsibility to the State Department.

I note this point only because I hope Members who are in disagreement with the individual foreign quotas which this bill has allotted, do not insist in their disagreement that the entire legislation must die because certain countries received quotas which they do not personally approve of. Rather I hope that they will direct their attention to the overall need for this act, and support it as an essential program for the protection of both consumer as well as the producers.

The other major objection which has been repeated over and over again refers to the compliance payments made under this act. One witness charged in a recent hearing on this legislation that this act costs the consumers over $500 million a year. Attacks are constantly being directed against the large producers who receive in excess of a quarter million dollars each of these payments. Twenty of these largest producers are located in my congressional district.

Let me say that if ever any limitation on compliance payments are made without repealing the tax which supports these payments, there is no question in my mind but that the sugar companies will either be: First, forced out of business, or, second, the current efficiencies and high-wage structure of our sugar workers will be drastically cut back by forcing the companies to split up into smaller entities, which would be less economic, carved to the size required by whatever limitation was placed upon the payments to be made. It would serve no purpose in terms of dollars saved, instead it would be destructive and would result in Government's dictating the size of the business enterprise without regard to the consequences for the workers, for the industry, and for the consuming public.

Furthermore, we are not even talking about subsidies, although you hear that word bandied about quite frequently in discussions about these sugar payments. These payments are made out of a processing tax which is paid by the industry. In 1969, payments to these producers amounted to $90.2 million, while the processing tax collected was $113.5 million. The sugar program is in effect paying into the Treasury millions of dollars each year. Instead of costing the taxpayers money, it has produced revenues in excess of $600 million in the 35 years of its existence.

So let us at least set the record straight when we refer to sugar payments. There is no cost to the American taxpayer. If you want to cut out the payments, then you must also repeal the excise tax. But when you do this, you have cut out the mechanism by which the industry is regulated, under which wages of workers are kept fair and reasonable, and by which labor standards are enforced and limits on production are applied. In addition, if you only limit the payments, what you have destroyed is the internal equity of the formula for distribution and companies such as those in Hawaii will be penalized simply for their size and forced to break up into smaller uneconomic entities if they want to continue in business.

Therefore, if it is in the national interest to safeguard the domestic production of sugar, and if it is in the national interest to assure the country of an adequate supply of sugar at reasonable cost to the consumer, then it is imperative that the Sugar Act be extended because it embodies these very concepts. I urge my colleagues to consider these arguments carefully and to support the 3-year extension of the program as it is sought in H.R. 8866.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CAFFERY).

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. Chairman, it is with pleasure I rise in support of this bill. I wish to take the opportunity to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE), the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, and all that committee, on the splendid work they have done in bringing before this body a Sugar Act which meets so well the needs and requirements of our sugarcane and sugar beet farmers, as well as the consumers.

Because no piece of legislation is more vital to my district in southern Louisiana, I have followed the work of the Agriculture Committee for many weeks. I know the task they faced and the long hours and hard work that were required of this diligent committee; and, Chairman POAGE, I know I speak for all our colleagues in saying that your achievement in this sugar bill exemplifies this body at its deliberative best.

I am grateful for this opportunity to bring to your attention the desires, the needs, and the strengths and contributions of the sugarcane farmers of the State of Louisiana. Sugarcane was introduced to Louisiana 25 years before this Nation proclaimed its Declaration of Independence. The Louisiana sugar industry has now completed its 176th consecutive crop, and in doing so the Louisiana sugar farmers have once again made a sizable and positive contribution to the economic and nutritional well-being of this country. The stamp of sugarcane is and has been imprinted across south Louisiana for two centuries, and it is impossible to think of the south Louisiana economy, culture, and landscape without sugarcane coming to mind.

My district begins in the east at New Orleans, and one can drive west for almost 200 miles to Lafayette and never be far out of sight of sugarcane fields. Sugarcane has been the economic backbone of my district for well over a century, and, even though today oil and gas and fishing industries have diversified and strengthened our economy, the well-being of our sugarcane farmers remains crucial to the economic well-being of the area.

To my constituents, the Sugar Act we are considering is not a cold and sterile collection of print and paper. It is their lifeblood. This bill affects not just the farmer and processor in south Louisiana. Every retail merchant, every gas station owner, every employee, and every insurance salesman looks to the cane-harvesting season with the same mixture of anticipation, dread, and hope that characterizes each fisherman as he hauls in his net.

A good harvest means jobs, purchasing power, a house mortgage that will not be foreclosed, and purchasing power and tax moneys for schools and roads. A poor harvest means tightening the belt, a son unable to go to college, or a father unemployed. My district produces more sugar than any single region in America. And so reliant are we upon this industry that its ebbs and flows affect the lives of all my people. So you see, the interest of my people is more than casual and academic.

I do not want to burden you with facts and figures or consumption estimates and import quotas. The bill and the report present these features in far greater clarity and cogency than time would afford me to do. I would like to congratulate the committee for the splendid job it has done in documenting this important legislation.

I would, however, bring to all of you

the message that, like the weather to the farmer, the U.S. Sugar Act is a life-giving instrument to my constituents and express my hope that you will give this legislation your unanimously favorable vote.

There is probably no group of individuals in America more aware of or attuned to the importance of agriculture in the total fabric of American life than the distinguished members of the Agriculture Committee. Long before the public in general became aware of it, this committee recognized that our agriculture policies are central to the success of the society as a whole. It is only now dawning on America which has been apparent to this committee for some time. That is, that we must take a broad all-encompassing view of the role of agriculture in our society. For it affects our environment, our economy, and our cultural life, and it will be a vital part of the heritage we pass on to future generations.

This bill is of tremendous importance to this Nation, not only because it provides for a stable sugar market, but also because it permits our farmers to stay on the land and encourages the continued revitalization of rural America. Welfare costs and agriculture may not seem related but it has now become apparent that the exodus from our farms has clogged our cities with millions of individuals unsuited to city life and unable to adjust to the demanding pace. Drug abuse is an increasing concern to all in this Nation but I submit that to remove people from contact with nature and the fields and streams, is to risk that they will seek relief from stress of life in other ways.

I support this bill because I deeply feel there is a desperate need to rekindle the spark of hope in rural America and to prevent the exodus of farming people from farmlands. The enormous transportation tangle and the pollution crisis are reaching giant proportions all across the country. But I submit that had our vast farm areas not emptied forth rural people into crowded cities, we would not be facing this problem.

The soul-searing experience of poverty that is at this moment warping the minds of millions of our urban young people could surely be ameliorated by better balance between urban and rural population. A poor boy and a rich boy have little to separate them in the woods, or in the fields, or on a river, or on a lake. But in the city this is not the case. The rich and the poor lead vastly different lives, and the ever-growing cost of crime might be stark testimony to the bitterness that can grow from such a difference.

In short, what I am saying is that it makes little sense to save 200 million American consumers a fraction of a penny on a pound of sugar, with policies *that end* up costing billions and billions in welfare costs, pollution costs, transportation costs, drug abuse and crime costs, and a serious deterioration of the spiritual fabric of our society.

I respectfully urge you to keep these considerations in mind when the vote on this bill is taken.

I believe the above observations continue to hold firmly true concerning the need for balance between sugar produced domestically and sugar imported from abroad. My position on sugar legislation is the same as it is in all of agriculture and that is: We must protect American farmers. I am not an isolationist and I full well recognize the need for a happy balance of trade with our foreign friends. But I say not at the sacrifice of our own people. I strongly question whether it will benefit us to maintain happy diplomatic relations with foreign countries if our own farmers are going broke.

I am pleased to note that the General Accounting Office in September of 1969 recommended that our balance-of-payments situation could be improved by better utilizing our domestic sugar producing capability. That report stated and I quote:

> In view of the significant benefits which would accrue to the domestic sugar industry and the beneficial effect on the U.S. balance-of-payments position through a reduction in the outflow of dollars, we recommend that the Congress in its extension of the legislation—which expires on December 31, 1971—consider modification of the deficit allocation provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to allocate continuing, long-term deficits of a domestic area to other domestic areas rather than to foreign countries.

In commenting on the GAO report Secretary Hardin stated:

> We agree with your premise that in recent years the domestic areas such as a group have been permitted to market a smaller proportion of the national sugar requirements than the Congress expected at the time it enacted the 1965 amendments to the Sugar Act . . . When sugar legislation is next considered by the Congress, it is the view of this Department that consideration should be given to enabling the domestic areas to market a substantially larger proportion of national requirements than is possible at present.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, might I only observe that the sugar industry in Louisiana and all over this country plays a key role in a vital and productive rural America. The Sugar Act has helped it to do so and there can be no question but that all our people have benefited.

I urge all Members of this body to join me in voting to extend the act, and in closing I would like to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE) and the Agriculture Committee for its vital role in a truly outstanding job of keeping American agriculture foremost in the world.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BADILLO).

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my very deep concern over the manner in which Puerto Rico is treated under the legislation presently before us.

One of the key provisions of this bill calls for the reduction of the Puerto Rican quota by 285,000 short tons during the first 2 years of the extension and by 140,000 short tons during the third and final year of the extension. Thus, the present quota of 1,140,000 tons will be reduced to 885,000 tons for 1972 and 1973 and 1,000,000 tons for 1974.

As many of our colleagues already know, sugar production in Puerto Rico has sharply declined in recent years. In 1968, for example, 637,000 tons were produced. In 1969 this figure dropped to 477,000 tons and in 1970 it was at 455,000 tons. The Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico claims that this situation is due in great part to the lag in research on the island with regard to crop varieties, agronomic practices, and production techniques; the inability of the island's sugar industry to mechanize; and the greater distance from markets and higher marketing costs than other producing areas. In the past 10 years the number of operating raw sugar factories has decreased by almost half and, in the same period, the number of sugarcane growers has fallen by almost 10,000.

Because of the major decline in sugar production on the island, Puerto Rico has been unable to meet the present quota for a number of years. I am informed that, as a consequence, the proposed reduction under H.R. 8866 is considered to be acceptable to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and that there is an understanding that the quota will revert back to its present level if the $100 million program launched by the Commonwealth 2 years ago to rehabilitate the sugar industry is successful. In a letter circulated to Members of Congress yesterday, my distinguished colleague, the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, expresses his consent to the reduction and urges support for the bill. While I certainly understand Mr. CÓRDOVA's good intentions, I fail completely to understand his rationale. Where is the incentive to increase productivity if the quota has been reduced? What assurances are there that the present Puerto Rican quot will, in fact, be reinstated in 4 or 5 years? Who believes that Louisiana and Florida, which are receiving quota increases at Puerto Rico's expense, will willingly accede to a future reduction in the new quota? If Puerto Rico is having production difficulties under the present quota, should not the Federal Government concentrate its efforts in assisting Puerto Rico to increase sugar productivity, rather than simply cutting the quota?

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8866 is unacceptable in numerous other respects—the continuation of a quota for the racist Government of South Africa, the grossly inflated prices paid to foreign producers, the lack of any subsidy limit—and I shall not address myself to these issues as a number of other colleagues have announced their intentions to do so. However, the manner in which Puerto Rico is treated by this measure is deplorable, and I feel I must speak out on it. The Puerto Rican sugar industry at this crucial period deserves all possible support and encouragement, and I believe we would be doing it a great disservice if we were to lower the present quota. It is perfectly obvious that the increases being granted to Louisiana and Florida are at the expense of Puerto Rico, all of

whom must also compete with foreign areas which supply from 37 to 45 percent of U.S. sugar requirements. I believe this ill-conceived plan will not only seriously damage the morale of Puerto Rican growers but it is fraught with potential disaster in the future absence of any specific assurances that a more favorable quota will be reinstituted in the future.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA).

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, as one who has observed at first hand and marveled at the successful operation of the Sugar Act in the State of Hawaii, I rise in support of H.R. 8866, the Sugar Act Amendments of 1971.

At the outset, I would like to commend the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee (Mr. POAGE), who, for the first time since ascending to the chairmanship, presided over the difficult and protracted task of forging a new sugar bill. Great demands on his leadership and patience were made during the hearings and the executive sessions which followed, and throughout the proceedings he responded in a most creditable manner. The bill we are now considering is in large part the result of his outstanding legislative craftsmanship. I must commend, too, the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BELCHER) for his untiring effort to write an acceptable sugar bill and for his willingness to compromise to attain that objective.

Mr. Chairman, it is indeed gratifying to see an act of Congress, as we do in the case of the Sugar Act, which while fulfilling its original legislative purpose, continues to confer daily benefits upon all Americans. In this regard the Sugar Act has been good for the sugar producer, the sugarworker, the consumer, and most importantly, for the taxpayer. It has been good for the producer because it has stabilized the industry and provided him with a fair return for his product. It has been good for the sugarworker because under its provisions he has been paid better than in other agricultural industries. In Hawaii, for example, the lowest paid fieldworker earns about $36 a day, including fringe benefits. The act has been good for the consumer because it has given him a steady reliable supply of sugar at a reasonable price, and it has been good for the taxpayer because the sugar program has not cost him a penny. In fact, he has profited from the act to the tune of $600 million since its enactment. This is the amount paid by the sugar industry into the Federal Treasury over and above the cost of the program, including compliance payments to producers.

The sugar program, now in its 37th year, has succeeded to a remarkable degree in achieving all its objectives.

Without a doubt, the American consumer has been the greatest beneficiary of the Sugar Act which, unless H.R. 8866 is enacted, will expire on December 31 of this year. Seasonal variations and sometimes unexplained fluctuations in the price of other food items may cause the consumer considerable concern. But he knows that he can always count on an ample supply of sugar at prices which are not only reasonable but also remarkably stable, month after month.

The favored position of the American consumer is highlighted when an international comparison is made in terms of purchasing power—that is, the length of time a person must work to purchase 1 pound of sugar at retail. In the United States it takes the average wage earner only 2.4 minutes of work to earn enough money for a pound of sugar. Comparable figures for other countries, on an ascending cost scale, are: Sweden, 4.1 minutes; Great Britain, 4.9; Germany, 6.9; France, 8.9; Italy, 14; and Japan, 16.9 minutes.

Moreover, the stability of the price of sugar in the United States can be graphically shown when it is compared with our per capita disposable income. Using the years from 1935 to 1939 as the base period—100—the relative price of sugar in 1969 was a little above 200. By contrast, per capita disposable income had risen to almost 600. In other words, the relative price of sugar in 1969 was only one-third of what it was during the pre-World War II period.

Mr. Chairman, the bill, of course, is not perfect. I myself am displeased over the rejection of an amendment which I offered in committee to set a minimum wage of $2 an hour for all sugar workers in the United States. I offered this amendment because at the hearings on the extension of the Sugar Act held by the Agriculture Committee, I heard shocking testimony presented by certain witnesses who described, principally from firsthand experiences, an almost unbelievable degree of exploitation, deprivation, poverty, and shameful mistreatment of field workers on some of the sugar plantations here in our own United States. The testimony was shocking because the witnesses were describing the conditions which I as a boy witnessed on the sugar plantations in Hawaii more than 40 years ago, but which were eradicated about three decades ago.

The story told by the witnesses was painfully remeniscent of my own experience: Sugar workers being kept in a continuously losing race against mounting debts, between low wages and high company store prices; having to live in company-owned shacks, complete with leaky roofs, holes in the walls, and an ever-increasing resident rat population; suffering the injustices, large and small, perpetrated or sanctioned by the plantation bosses.

The tragedy of the testimony was that it dealt with the current plight of men, women and children on Louisiana sugar plantations and in northern sugar beet areas. The conditions I had found insufferable 40 years ago are those under which thousands upon thousands of Americans are living today.

These conditions ought not to be permitted to exist today, Mr. Chairman. The Hawaiian sugar plantations have proven by example that under the present Sugar Act, they can provide decent wages and working conditions, conducive to human dignity.

In addition to the highest agricultural wages in the world, Hawaiian sugar workers get fringe benefits of approximately $1.25 an hour in value in the form of paid vacations, paid holidays, pensions, health insurance, unemployment compensation and workmen's compensation. These benefits are conspicuously missing from the compensation picture of mainland sugar fieldworkers.

I must emphasize that these conditions which have made Hawaii a comparative paradise for sugar workers were obtained within the framework of existing and past sugar legislation. Hawaii was not given any extra or special benefits. Our workers prospered under the very same legislation which benefits the mainland sector of the industry.

If Hawaiian plantations can provide justice and equity for their workers, I can perceive no valid reason why the mainland sugar industry should be allowed to maintain conditions of exploitation. While supporting the 1971 Sugar Act, therefore, I call upon my colleagues who represent districts where the sugar interests have permitted such conditions to exist to urge their constituents to follow Hawaii's example and give their fieldworkers and others their fair share of the benefits.

Mr. Chairman, I was also displeased over the fact that the quota for the Philippines was decreased rather than increased. One of the main standards according to which foreign sugar quotas were considered and adjusted was the question of whether or not the government of the quota country was friendly to the United States. Following this standard, I strongly opposed amendments aimed at the reduction of the Philippine quota. I was successful to the degree that the quota for the Republic of the Philippines has been retained at 1,126,020 tons. But its deficit allotment, that is, its share of the reallotment of the quotas of other countries or domestic areas which are unable to meet their quotas, has been reduced by some 10 percent under the new bill.

Although I have no intention of upsetting the applecart, I do hope that the Senate will take appropriate action, not merely to restore the status quo but to increase the Philippine sugar quota.

There are at least four compelling reasons for treating the Philippines as a favored foreign sugar quota country. First, citizens of the Philippines have always been our good friends. Ever since Admiral Dewey destroyed the Spanish fleet in Manila Bay in 1898, Filipinos and Americans fought side by side on Bataan and Corregidor in the early dark days of World War II. And after a period of American tutelage on July 4, 1946, the Philippines were granted full independence. In effect, therefore, the United States helped to give birth to a new nation.

Second, the current economic situation in the Philippines is such that that country urgently needs our help. In view of our close ties with that country, an increased sugar quota would help considerably to boost its ecoenomy and strengthen its position as an independent nation.

Third, a number of sugar plantations in the Philippines are owned and operated by American interests. By curtail-

ing Philippine participation in meeting U.S. sugar requirements, we would actually be hurting Americans. Surely, there is every justification to favor foreign sugar interests which represent heavy investments of American capital.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, because of devastating typhoons the Republic of the Philippines on occasion has experienced difficulty in meeting its quota. Unfortunately the Sugar Act does not make allowances for acts of God, but shortages caused by such damage certainly ought not to penalize the foreign sugar quota country involved. It is noteworthy, in this respect, that the Philippines will reap a bumper sugar crop this year and should be able and willing to deliver its full share and more.

Despite its shortcomings, Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is a good bill. It continues for another 3 years the most successful agricultural program ever devised by Congress—one which has proven of benefit to all concerned.

I urge my colleagues to vote for a good thing—support the Sugar Act Amendments of 1971.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Time of the gentleman from Hawaii has expired.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE) for the superb and constructive statement that he made on the floor of the House here this afternoon.

During the time that this bill has been before our committee, I have deliberated with the gentleman at length and in depth, and though I disagree in the conclusion that he has drawn on this bill, I know that the sole motivation for his opposition is based on adherence to the principle in which he believes. It is that kind of adherence which causes the great admiration that I have for my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, during the committee's lengthy deliberations on this legislation, I offered an amendment to section 206 of the Sugar Act to include beet sugar molasses, which is in special demand for the manufacture of citric acid, yeast, and pharmaceutical products, among those products imported into this country which the Secretary may limit if he determines they interfere with the objectives of the act.

This addition to section 206, which was adopted by the committee, is designed to help check the excessive flow of beet sugar molasses into this country and provide relief for our growers and processors, especially those in Ohio and Michigan who have experienced serious disruptions of the domestic market.

In some cases, several European and Mediterranean countries have been subsidizing their own producers, thereby enabling them to undercut the U.S. market price by as much as 30 percent in recent years. Although a countervailing duty order was recently issued against France, the practice still persists in other countries and continues to be a problem to our own beet molasses growers.

More importantly, however, there is indication that these excessive imports can, in part, be attributed to triangular trading with Cuba by countries otherwise friendly to the United States. The purchase of cheap cane molasses from Cuba by certain foreign concerns has enabled them to substitute the Cuban cane molasses for domestic uses, thereby releasing the local beet molasses for exportation into this country where there is a special demand by several large corporate buyers. This triangular trading with Cuba subverts our trade embargo on Cuba and helps relieve Cuba's economic pressures at the expense of our own producers in this country.

This change in the present law provided for in H.R. 8866 will create the means by which we can more effectively respond to excessive imports of beet sugar molasses and secure more equitable market conditions in which our own producers can compete.

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

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. ABERNETHY).

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to take a few seconds in concluding the debate on this most important bill, I wish to congratulate and pay my respect to my chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE) and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BELCHER) for the fine work they have done and the excellent leadership they have provided in bringing this legislation to this point.

Mr. Chairman, these two gentlemen have proven themselves to be influential and distinguished leaders in this body. This is one of the most complicated pieces of legislation considered every few years by this House. And my chairman, Mr. POAGE, and the ranking minority leader, Mr. BELCHER, are entitled to the appreciation of this House and that of the Nation's sugar consumers for their great effort.

Our committee has worked for 10 weeks and put in long hours in hearing witnesses and counseling among ourselves on this measure. I want to commend the members of the committee for the fine support they have given our chairman and Mr. BELCHER throughout these long weeks of labor and effort.

Mr. Chairman, I was honored that my chairman designated me to serve as chairman of the subcommittee to assemble the first draft of the legislation. I am indebted to each of the subcommittee members for their diligence and dedicated effort. We assembled a draft that was accepted by the full committee with very little change. We were aided by our very able staff which I desire to compliment and thank.

Mr. Chairman, it has been a pleasure to work with the members of the committee and with the staff in bringing this bill to the floor of the House. It is a good bill. It is good for consumers and for sugar producers. And it is also good for our trade policy and friends abroad.

I commend the legislation to your consideration and urge your support.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8866 is as important to the sugar consumer as it is to the sugar industry.

The major purpose of the sugar program is to insure that consumers have adequate supplies of sugar at fair prices, at all times.

The program has met that goal. Consumers do indeed enjoy ample supplies of sugar at reasonable prices. We have two cane sugar refineries in Chicago. One is operated by Amstar Corp., and the other by Sucrest Corp. Both of these refineries help supply the huge food processing industry that is centered in and around Chicago.

Over the years, a smaller proportion of our sugar has been distributed through retail stores. Today, the food processing industry is the big user of sugar—it buys 75 percent of the sugar distributed in the United States.

These food processors, or sugar users as they are normally referred to, are the bakers, canners, confectioners, dairy manufacturers, bottlers, and many others. Sugar is an important ingredient in many of the products they produce.

The sugar users are eager to get sugar at reasonable prices, and they couple that desire with a demand that they have all of the sugar they need at all times. They operate thousands of plants that are dependent upon a constant supply of sugar. Their sugar needs must be met on a day-to-day basis. Any interruption in the delivery of sugar could be disastrous to the sugar users.

The assurance of supply brought about by the sugar program has enabled the sugar users to minimize the need of carrying costly inventories of sugar, all to the ultimate benefit of the consumers of their products. Under the sugar program, they have had ample supplies of sugar at fair prices.

Years before the adoption of the program, the wholesale price of sugar tended to be above the index of all food prices at wholesale. Since the program began operating, however, the price of sugar has been under the index of all foods.

H.R. 8866 contains a number of changes that are designed to strengthen the program, many of which were recommended by the sugar users.

I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 8866.

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Chairman, we have recently heard much blind criticism of one of the most effective and most equitable programs this Congress has ever devised. I am speaking of the Sugar Act, a program which has protected and truly enhanced this country's sugar industry at both the producer and processor level, while guaranteeing the American consumer a stable supply of sugar at a most reasonable cost.

At the same time, this program has actually cost the Government no cash outlay—returning more dollars to the Treasury than it has paid out.

In addition to stabilizing the sugar industry and market, the sugar program has provided widespread benefits to the thousands of Americans who earn their living in sugar production.

These benefits are unparalleled in the myriad of other farm programs we have implemented.

In 1968, the most recent year for which complete figures are available, there were 168,000 farm workers employed in the sugar industry. That same year, there were another 43,500 workers employed sugar prices. Because of the Sugar Act, these people were all guaranteed at least the minimum wage, and that provision has been rigidly enforced. The act, among other benefits, safeguards against the exploitation of child labor.

Today's American housewife has no concern over sugar shortages, or high sugar prices. Because of the Sugar Act, she has come to take such things as plentiful supplies and stable prices for granted. Such is not the case in other countries of the world, where sugar hoarding and sugar shortages are often the rule.

Were these concrete facts commonly known, I am certain that the critics of this legislation would vanish.

Further, I am pleased that the proposed extension of the Sugar Act allows California, at long last, to produce sugar from cane as well as beets—thus gaining the advantage of year-round use of the expensive equipment used in processing and refining sugar.

I urge my colleagues to support the extension of the sugar program, as it is before us today.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the sugar program is, among other things, designed to promote the foreign trade of the United States.

We in Philadelphia are well aware of the importance of foreign trade to our Nation's economy. Our port is the third busiest in the world, and the leading importing port in the United States. Around 17 percent of the Nation's import tonnage moves through it.

The handling of these imports and the exports, which are also substantial, creates direct employment for thousands of workers.

Sugar is one of the more important products moving into the port of Philadelphia. The tonnage of sugar involved places it third among imported commodities, behind petroleum and iron ore.

Last year, over 1 million tons of sugar moved into the port. It came from Hawaii and Puerto Rico, and from 16 different foreign nations. Around 100 ships were required to move this valuable cargo.

The sugar is received by two large cane sugar refineries that are located in Philadelphia. They produce and distribute a host of refined sugars for food processors and retail shoppers.

Sugar imports stimulate the need for labor in many fields. Employment is not limited to refinery labor and others directly involved in supporting the refinery operation, such as longshoremen, weighers, and teamsters.

Other businesses, indigenous to a thriving port, are required to supply and service the many sugar ships.

Under our sugar program, we pay the foreign nations a fair price for their sugar, and they, in return, are required to gear their production and maintain ample stocks in order to meet our sugar needs. They must ship here, even at times when they could get more by selling to some other nation.

And there is a bonus involved. The sugar producing nations depend upon the United States for a multitude of industrial and agricultural products. The dollars they earn by selling sugar to us, help them buy our products. Their purchases stimulate still more labor here among people employed in export-oriented industry.

U.S. exports to these nations totaled over $7.7 billion in 1969. We had a favorable balance of trade with them of $1.2 billion, which helped our balance-of-payments situation.

The sugar program is indeed promoting our foreign trade, in addition to insuring that consumers have ample supplies of sugar at reasonable prices under all conditions.

I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 8866.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, sugar is one of the most important products brought into the port of Baltimore. It ranks fourth in important tonnage, behind iron ore, residual fuel oil, and gypsum.

In 1970, over 50 ships brought 714,000 tons of sugar to the port, which were destined for Amstar Corp.'s huge cane sugar refinery.

The refinery employs around 1,000 people, and its annual payroll is $7.5 million. A 1969 study indicated that the refinery generated another $14.6 million in indirect employment income.

Sugar imports generate employment in many fields. It is not limited to refinery labor, and others employed by allied industry—longshoremen, railroad workers, and teamsters. The refinery meets the needs of sugar consumers in and around Baltimore, and in other parts of Maryland and neighboring States.

Many businesses are, for example, needed to supply and service the ships involved. The refinery produces and distributes over 1 billion pounds of sugar a year. Around 75 percent of the sugar produced is distributed to food processors. They use sugar as an ingredient in their products.

I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8866, a bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act.

The sugar industry is extremely important to Idaho. My State now ranks second only to California as a producer of sugar beets. The economic livelihood of thousands of independent sugar-beet growers and that of many hundreds of sugar company employees is directly related to the passage of this legislation before us today.

But I would remind my colleagues that it is not just the sugar-beet farmers and the workers employed by the sugar companies who benefit from a viable sugar industry.

Rather, the beet sugar industry is one of the Nation's annually renewable resources. Soil and water and sunshine are the basic ingredients of the agricultural formula, and in the annual miracle of sugar-beet crop production they combine to provide a good source of income to western and midwestern farm communities and States.

The Department of Agriculture reports that money received by Idaho sugar beet growers for their 1969 crop—the latest year for which figures are available—amounted to some $56.9 million. These dollars spread outward from the farm into the farming communities and from there they move on to touch neighboring areas. The same is true of the money generated by the sale of sugar and sugar-beet byproducts.

A study was made recently at North Dakota University to determine the impact of a beet sugar processing facility of medium size on a rural area. The study suggested that the money paid to beet growers for their product would amount to about $6.5 million. This farm income, the study declared would be turned over seven times in the factory community. In addition to grower payments there would be an employee payroll of about $1 million and a transportation value of about $2.5 million. Then there would be factory purchases of fuel for power, paper for containers, and purchases of limerock and other raw materials used in manufacturing the sugar and purchases of other goods and services to operate the farms and factory.

The study concluded that in all, a single, medium-sized factory, utilizing $6.5 million worth of beets would return more than $27 million annually into an area.

You can easily see, therefore, what this industry, which now operates four factories in Idaho and processes some $56.9 million worth of sugar beets means to the citizens of the Gem State. It is, in economic terms, returning more than a quarter of a billion dollars to the communities and cities of Idaho and is in reality the generator of economic well-being for many of the State's citizens who are not even directly connected with the sugar industry.

Mr. Chairman, sugar beets have been a source of such income for Idaho citizens since 1903 when the first sugar-beet processing facility was constructed at Idaho Falls. This plant has been modernized and enlarged and continues to operate today. The State now serves as the home of the largest single processing plant in the Nation, if not the world, at Nampa plus processing plants at Mini-Cassia and Twin Falls.

But sugar beets are not just an industry, they are a way of life in Idaho. Farmers use the crop as the basis for their cropping programs and since sugar beets are normally planted in a 4-year rotation, the crop can be said to put approximately 800,000 acres to profitable use.

Beet sugar processing takes place during the fall and winter months, a period when farm, construction and other activities are at a seasonal low. The factory thus provides jobs at a time when they are most needed.

Mr. Chairman, the citizens of Idaho are proud of the State's position as the second largest sugar beet producing State in the Nation. Passage of this legislation will assure that Idaho's vital sugar-beet industry will be in the forefront of meeting its supply obligations to assure that Americans have ample supplies of this vital food.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 8866, as reported by the Committee on Agriculture.

For years, I have tried to impress upon my colleagues in the House the importance of the sugar program—its importance not only to the sugar industry, but its importance to the sugar consumer, and to others who benefit from the program.

In addition to meeting the needs of consumers, the Nation's sugar industry plays an important role in the economic well-being of many of our States from coast to coast and border to border. It provides employment for farmers and farm labor in the sugarcane and sugar beet fields, and for labor in the sugar factories and refineries. It also provides employment for thousands of others in allied industries.

I am, of course, more familiar with the cane sugar refining segment of the industry. In my district, in Boston, we have two huge cane sugar refineries that meet the sugar needs of most of the consumers in New England. One is operated by Amstar Corp., and the other by the Revere Sugar Refinery. They provide direct employment for over 1,000 workers, and maintain an annual payroll of over $9 million.

In addition to the employment provided by the refineries, the operation generates still more labor for thousands of others, including longshoremen, teamsters, and railroad workers.

The labor and industry generated by the refining industry in Boston is also generated in the other great refining centers, including the ports of New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore.

Last year, around one-half million tons of raw sugar moved into the port of Boston. In tonnage, sugar ranked as a leading import.

The ships that brought that sugar to Boston came from as near as Mexico, and as far as the Philippines. All told, that sugar came from 16 different nations around the globe.

For those nations, all of which are developing, these sugar sales are most important. They depend upon sugar and a handful of other products for most of their foreign exchange.

We are all well aware of the problems of the developing nations. They are desperately attempting to improve their lot by getting a fair price for their products, and by getting access to markets in developing nations.

We are committed to helping them attain these goals.

The sugar program is in step with that commitment. We pay them a fair price for their sugar, and we guarantee them access to a large part of our sugar market.

In return for this the foreign nations participating in the program are required to gear their production and maintain stocks in order to meet our needs. They are obligated to meet their commitment to provide us with sugar, even at times when they could get more by shipping to some other nation.

There is, of course, another consideration. This trade with these nations is not a one-way street.

The dollars these developing nations earn by selling sugar to the refiners enable them to buy the products of American agriculture and industry, thereby generating still more industry and labor here.

In 1969, U.S. exports to the nations participating in the sugar program totaled over $7.7 billion. We had a favorable balance of trade with these nations of $1.2 billion, which helped our balance-of-payments position.

Thus, the program is indeed meeting its goal of promoting the export trade of the United States.

It is also meeting its most important goal; namely, that of insuring that American consumers have adequate supplies of sugar at fair prices, under all conditions.

It is hard to find a bargain these days, but sugar has certainly got to qualify as one. Over the years, the price of sugar has gone up less than the price of most other foods and most other things the consumer buys.

And despite a lot of malarky about the so-called world price for sugar, American consumers pay less for their sugar than consumers in most of the other developed nations of the world.

There are nations that do buy their sugar on the world market. And consumers in some of them, perhaps two or three, do pay less than we do.

The sugar needs of those nations are, however, small compared to ours. Our sugar needs are, for example, 10 times as great as those of Canada.

What is more important, however, is that our program guarantees that we will have an uninterrupted supply of sugar. Nations that buy on the world market flirt with the possibility of sugar shortages or no sugar at all.

The need for an uninterrupted supply of sugar in the United States has intensified in recent years. The rapid development of the food processing industry has brought about a dramatic change in the distribution of sugar.

This change has made the sugar program as important to the sugar consumer as to the sugar producer.

Today, the food processors—the bakers, the bottlers, the canners, the confectioners, the dairy manufacturers, and others—are the big buyers of sugar.

These people are, in effect, the sugar consumers. They buy over 75 percent of the sugar sold in the United States.

To the food processors sugar is an important product ingredient. I doubt if any other single product is as important an ingredient as sugar is in so many different foods and beverages.

The food processors operate thousands of plants throughout the Nation, all of which are dependent upon an uninterrupted supply of sugar.

It comes as no surprise, therefore, that the industrial sugar users group does endorse H.R. 8866. This group represents most of the sugar-using food processors.

The user group clearly outlined the importance of the sugar program to it in its testimony before the Committee on Agriculture.

They are eager to buy sugar at a fair price, and are particularly concerned that they have access to adequate supplies of sugar under all conditions.

They indicated that a sound domestic industry and properly reimbursed foreign sugar suppliers were indispensable to insuring that they have the sugar when they need it.

So, as difficult as it may be for some people to understand, the sugar program has operated in the best interest of the sugar consumer, and the Nation in general.

On that record, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 8866.

I would like to also comment on the cutoff date of January 1, 1969. In my opinion many countries have records of expropriations going years back. I mention one that has come to my attention. This is a case of two natural citizens upon the Government of Bolivia.

On March 6, 1951, claimants jointly purchased 16,703 hectares — 45,098 acres—of land in Bolivia for approximately $45,000. On or about November 18, 1961, the National Agrarian Reform Council of the Bolivian Government by Supreme Resolution No. 109552 expropriated 8,725 hectares of claimants' land, along with buildings, agricultural equipment, livestock, vehicles, machinery, and related personalty.

A claim in the amount of $918,805 plus interest from the date of expropriation, was filed through the U.S. Department of State upon the Bolivian Government in December 1963. The Bolivian Government has made no meaningful gesture or proposal to compensate the claimants for the loss they have incurred. The Sugar Amendment Act of 1971 makes provision for relief for such expropriations subsequent to January 1, 1969. In the interest of justice and to further the intent of Congress, this date should be changed to January 1, 1961, and further any quota to Bolivia should be withheld pending a settlement herein.

This land is located in the Department of Santa Cruz, Province of Andres-Ibanez, Canton Catoca, and is known as Rincon de Suaces. After the purchase, the claimants, along with their employees and agents, continually worked the land until it was expropriated. Acreage was cleared, fences were strung around the property perimeter—3,000 meters—a road 40 kilometers—25 miles—long was built and a water well was dug. A house, a barn, a schoolhouse, and a tile factory were all constructed by the claimants. At the time of expropriation, the farm

was producing a good quality crop of coffee, sugarcane, soybeans, and developing a forestry industry. During the 1951–62 period, the claimants expended considerable sums for these improvements as well as for the purchase of agricultural equipment, livestock, vehicles, and machinery. Claimants ask $352,000 as compensation for this property.

The expropriated land was of excellent soil quality, insurpassable for agriculture. Included in the affected area is all the cultivated land, all the cleared land, all lumber-producing land, and all the land with improvements, such as buildings, wells, fences, and so forth. The claimants have been left with unimproved land with a low soil quality and with a very low market value. During 1963, the claimants had several experts examine the expropriated area and appraise its value. The estimates placed the land value at between $61 and $68.75 per hectare. Based on the $61 estimate, the claimants ask $532,225 for the 8,725 hectares expropriated.

I believe the sugar legislation in the future should take into concern cases as the one I just mentioned, and I intend to bring it to the concern of the committee in the future.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to House Resolution 471, providing for the consideration of H.R. 8866, the Sugar Act Amendments of 1971. This is a closed rule, waiving points of order against the bill, providing for 3 hours of debate. I am speaking on behalf of the point of view of Congressman WOLFF, of New York, and myself.

A number of witnesses appeared before the House Rules Committee yesterday to request an open rule or modified rule permitting various amendments. Mr. WOLFF, on behalf of both of us, requested a rule to permit an amendment to section 4(4) of the bill to add a new subsection (v) requiring each country sharing in the U.S. sugar market to donate to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian refugees a portion of the sugar needed by UNRWA after 1971. Each country should help fill UNRWA's needs by providing a percentage share of the UNRWA requirement equal to the per centum of the U.S. sugar market assigned to that country. The text of our proposed amendment follows:

Page 8, after line 9 insert the following:
(v) by adding at the end of paragraph (6) the following: "If any foreign country fails to give assurance to the Secretary on or before December 31, 1971, that such country will supply as a donation the percentage share as hereinafter provided of the quantity of sugar needed for Palestinian refugees as established and announced annually for years after 1971 by the United Nations Relief and Work Agency, the quota for such country for such years shall not be established. The percentage shares of the quantity of sugar needed for Palestinian refugees to be supplied by the Republic of the Philippines and Ireland are respectively 27.36 per centum and 0.13 per centum; and each of the countries listed in paragraphs (A) and (B) of subsection 202(c)(3) will supply a percentage share of the remainder of the quantity of sugar needed for Palestinian refugees equal to the per centum stated for such country in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection 202(c)(3). The quota for any country for which such assurance is not given shall be prorated to other foreign countries in the same manner as deficits are prorated under section 204 of this Act. The Secretary shall issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this paragraph."

Mr. Chairman, this language was not presented to the Agriculture Committee for inclusion in the committee bill, because we became aware of UNRWA's need in this area only last week. On June 4, we and our colleagues on the Near East Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee met informally with Sir John Shaw Rennie, Commissioner General of UNRWA, and Mr. Jan van Wijik, the UNRWA Liaison Officer at the United Nations in New York. Sir John Rennie informed us that UNRWA, which works with approximately 1.5 million refugees, now faces a financial crisis. The estimated deficit for next year is between $6 and $7 million.

The Commissioner General suggested that one way of alleviating UNRWA's financial plight would be to secure donations of basic commodities needed for use in the refugee camps. However, most basic commodities—including rice, wheat, and flour—are already donated by the United States and Western European countries. Sugar is the only international commodity which UNRWA must buy on the world market.

It is estimated that, for use in the next year, UNRWA will need 7,000 tons of sugar. If purchased on the world market at the world price of roughly 4 cents per pound, that sugar would cost approximately $560,000. Therefore, if that 7,000 tons of sugar were donated for the work with Palestinian refugees, UNRWA's deficit would be reduced by a substantial amount.

Under the terms of the humanitarian amendment we would have offered if the Rules Committee had agreed to a modified rule, a country would donate to the agency a portion of UNRWA's projected sugar needs proportionate to the U.S. sugar quota assigned to that country. The Republic of the Philippines, for example, currently receives 27.36 percent of the U.S. quota; that country will export 1,314,018 tons of sugar to the U.S. next year, at a total purchase price of approximately $610 million. If the Philippines donated 27.36 percent of UNRWA's projected need of 7,000 tons for next year, or 1,915 tons, that would constitute a donation of approximately $153,216, based on a world market price of 4 cents per pound. The Philippines, which holds the largest share of the U.S. sugar quota, can certainly afford to make this contribution, especially in view of the fact that the cost would be less than 1 percent of the Philippine profit from its U.S. quota. And this is the country from which the largest contribution to UNRWA would be expected.

In our judgment, this amendment would provide substantial financial relief for the Palestinian refugee program without imposing undue hardship on any of the countries from which the U.S. buys sugar. We are working in many directions to achieve peace in the Middle East, but any ultimate resolution of the problem will require some solution to the plight of the Arab refugees. This amendment supported by members of the Near East Subcommittee would be one small contribution toward helping to meet their very great needs.

We bring this proposed amendment to the attention of the Congress at this point because the close rule on this sugar legislation adopted by the House today, has prevented amendments being in order. This proposal should receive careful attention by both the Senate and the House.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 8866, the Sugar Act Amendments of 1971.

This act is extremely well named—unless you consider the consumer, the farm laborer, and the taxpayer. For the foreign sugar plantations, and for domestic sugar corporations, this act is not only sugar, it is gravy.

CONSUMER PAYS HIGHER PRICES

The purpose of the Sugar Act is to "assure to U.S. consumers a plentiful supply of sugar at reasonable prices." However, the American housewife is forced to buy sugar at a higher rate than shoppers in other nations. In August 1970, the American housewife paid over 13 cents for a pound of sugar. This is compared to the Norwegian housewife who paid only 7 cents a pound; the English housewife who paid only 8 cents a pound; and the housewife in Mexico who paid only 5 cents for a pound of sugar. Even the Agriculture Committee recognized this fact when it stated:

The U.S. quota system under most circumstances does make prices to consumers higher than would prevail if it were possible to purchase all our supplies at current world market price levels.

As a result of the Sugar Act, the Consumers Association of the District of Columbia estimated that—

The cost to Americans of the higher price of sugar probably range between $200 million and over a half billion dollars a year.

Mr. Chairman, in no way does the Sugar Act benefit the consumer. Quite to the contrary. Because of the Sugar Act, every person in the United States pays approximately $3 more for his annual supply of sugar than he would at world market prices. And where does the additional $3 a person end up? Generally, it ends up in the pockets of the foreign sugar barons who hire expensive lobbyists to come to Washington and seek permission to export their sugar to the United States.

WINDFALL FOR FOREIGN SUGAR PRODUCERS

The Sugar Act allows foreign sugar corporations to export about 4.8 million tons of sugar to the United States. Because of the guaranteed high price, foreign sugar producers battle to receive a large quota. A large quota will result in a larger share of the $288 million pie that is in excess of what the foreign corporations would receive at world market prices.

The bill before us now, H.R. 8866, al-

lows Ecuador, a country which has constantly violated international law by seizing our tuna boats, to ship 79,852 tons of sugar to the United States. In 1970, this represented earnings to Ecuadorian sugar interests of $8.9 million from sales in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, my desire is not to enact oppressive legislation, nor is it to prohibit the importation of Ecuadorian sugar.

My aim is to insure the safety and security of U.S. fishermen on the high seas.

However, I want it made perfectly clear to countries which illegally seize and harass our fishermen that we will not tolerate such action.

The Sugar Act could have done this, but it has not done so. In the past, there have been amendments to the Sugar Act which would allow the cancellation of the sugar quota of any country expropriating U.S. property without proper compensation—yet, this has been ignored.

I believe that the Sugar Act should be amended to require the cancellation of a quota to any country which seizes U.S. fishing vessels in international waters.

Our only recourse, since our own State Department refuses to institute action, is for Congress to take action to end the tuna war. But, because the Sugar Act may not be amended, Ecuador can continue to seize our vessels and collect fines totaling over $1.3 million in this year alone and, at the same time, profit by sales of sugar to the United States.

BURDEN ON THE U.S. TAXPAYER

Mr. Chairman, not only does the consumer pay higher prices for sugar, but the American taxpayer is asked to support the domestic sugar industry with payments of about $91 million annually.

These payments go to sugar producers who, unlike other farmers, are not limited by law to a maximum payment of $55,000 a year. In 1970, 64 firms received $16.2 million and, in fact, three sugar producers received well over $1 million each.

I strongly endorsed moves to limit farm payments to $10,000 in other segments of agriculture and I feel that the same should apply to sugar producers. However, because the Sugar Act cannot be amended, the taxpayer will continue to foot the bill to the tune of over $90 million a year.

FARM LABORER DOES NOT SHARE IN BENEFITS

In order to receive a sugar payment, a producer must not hire children under 14 years of age, and he must pay wages which are determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be "fair and reasonable."

However, the sugar worker, like other farm workers, is in the deepest and direst poverty.

Wages are set after the Secretary of Agriculture has held hearings around the country. Because the sugar workers are not organized and because they are not represented, it is commonplace for hearings to take place without anyone presenting the field workers' case at all.

Wage hearings have been held in the winter months and have generally resulted in input only from sugar producers with very little participation from farm workers.

The average sugar worker's annual income in Louisiana is $2,634, which is $500 below the $3,120 which would be earned by a worker working a 40-hour week, 52 weeks a year, at $1.50 an hour.

According to a study of conditions in Louisiana, the sugarcane worker is not reaping the benefits that other workers are receiving.

According to the Statistical Abstract:

The median income in the State of Louisiana in 1967 was $7,182 . . . Even when compared to other agriculture workers, a segment of the labor force which is notoriously underpaid, cane workers come out poorly. As of April, 1969 the average annual income of a family headed by a farm worker who was provided with a house was $3,552, almost $1,000 more than the figure for cane workers.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I oppose this measure as a waste of tax dollars, as a foreign giveaway, and as providing added costs to the consumer.

If we were allowed to amend H.R. 8866, I feel that we could have made some constructive amendments. But, since this is not possible, I feel that we should junk the program and save the taxpayer $90 million and the consumer the millions of dollars in added costs.

Mr. LINK. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 8866, to extend the Sugar Act for 3 years.

Our traditional sugar policy benefits the consumers of America in making available a constant supply of sugar from domestic and foreign producers at a reasonable price. It is sound to keep a proper balance between domestic and foreign suppliers, and I believe we have maintained an equitable balance in this bill.

Coming from the State of North Dakota, which now supplies about 3 percent of the Nation's beet sugar and which is ideally suited to grow more, I am gratified that the bill maintains the basic 62 percent domestic-38 percent foreign ratio and the more favorable 65 percent-35 percent foreign ratio for the yearly growth in U.S. sugar requirements.

The latter feature offers encouragement to sugar-beet farmers in my region who are willing and able to produce additional sugar beets. It will make more feasible the construction of a new refinery in the Red River Valley of North Dakota and Minnesota.

Having participated in months of hearings on this legislation, I have observed the diligence and dedication of our committee chairman, the Honorable Mr. POAGE. I congratulate my distinguished colleague for his able leadership in shepherding this important legislation, which I hope the House will approve today.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8866, a bill to extend the Sugar Act, with modifications, for 3 years to December 31, 1974.

This legislation has a long history of providing adequate supplies of sugar to the people of the United States at reasonable prices which dates back to 1934. This act has also provided for the maintenance of a substantial domestic sugar industry with an increasing capacity of over 50 percent of our present domestic needs, a domestic capability which has been valuable in balancing the effects of wide fluctuations in world sugar production. This domestic production capacity also provides for a continuing supply of sugar in the face of the discontinuance of certain foreign sources, as in the case of Cuba.

In the nearly 37 years since the enactment of the first sugar legislation, we have maintained a stable control on sugar supplies and prices. The sugar tax and conditional payment system have enabled the United States to maintain a strong domestic sugar industry while offering added incentives to small volume sugar farmers. Simultaneously under the provisions of this law, collections have exceeded disbursements by over $600 million since the program began in 1934.

In my own district in Florida, we have a very strong cane sugar industry. Sugar production in Florida has averaged over 600,000 tons per year over the last 4 years. While maintaining this capacity, collections under the sugar tax have exceeded disbursements under the conditional payment plan by over $1.25 million since 1967.

This act also has many controls which may be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to insure that the provisions of the law are carried out. In a period when respect for American property rights are at a very low level in certain areas of the world, I am encouraged by a particular provision of this proposed legislation. Under the provisions of section 408 of H.R. 8866, the President is authorized to levy and collect an impost of $20 per ton on sugar imported from a nation which has unlawfully nationalized, expropriated, seized, or otherwise affected control of American-owned property. This impost would be used to repay claims of individuals arising from the aforementioned actions.

This legislation has filled a great public need in the years it has been in effect, and will continue to do so, provided it is extended. If the United States is to remain a strong international power we must maintain certain capabilities domestically. Sugar production is one of these national needs.

Under the provisions of this legislation mainland cane production quotas in Florida and Louisiana would be expanded by 300,000 tons annually. This increase would result from the cancellation of the Virgin Islands quota of 15,000 tons where sugar production has been discontinued, and a cutback of 285,000 tons in the first 2 years in the quota for Puerto Rico where production has declined, and an additional cutback of 140,000 tons in the third year of the extension. The bill would also provide a quota of as much as 100,000 tons for a new continental cane sugar area or areas beginning in 1973.

I am particularly pleased with the action of the committee in this regard because stringent acreage restrictions in Florida that have been in existence in the mainland cane sugar area each year under the Sugar Act Amendments of 1965 principally because yields per acre have tended to improve.

Continuation of this act and the continued expansion of our domestic sugar production capacity as provided in H.R. 8866 should have a favorable effect on our balance-of-payments position, and continue to provide substantial employment and income for many Americans.

I urge the passage of H.R. 8866 to continue a program which has a long and successful history of accomplishing the purposes for which it was intended.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the debate over the amendment to suspend the South African sugar quota is but a symptom of all that is wrong with the Sugar Act itself. By guaranteeing a share of the rich U.S. market to certain preferred foreign sugar producers the Sugar Act has become, in effect, an unregulated foreign-aid program with an annual value ranging between $250 and $350 million. Unlike the typical assistance program, however, this one is financed, not by the American taxpayer but by the American consumer and distributed, not according to social and economic needs but unjust and indiscriminate whimsy.

All too often the Sugar Act has been a tool of foreign policy, penalizing those countries which may drift from the official U.S. line and setting up the House Agriculture Committee as an extension of the State Department. The merits of the South African case aside, my point is simply that the American consumer should not be a pawn in an international game of chess and an agricultural assistance program not primarily a tool of foreign policy. Without reservation I oppose the extension of the Sugar Act.

The ostensible purpose of this legislation is to guarantee U.S. producers their fair share of the American market for sugar. By restricting foreign imports to 34 percent domestic growers are protected from their lower priced foreign competition. In turn, those nations granted a quota are assured huge profits from their sales in the high-priced American market.

Translating this system into plain language, it means simply that the American consumer pays 30 cents more for a 10-pound bag of sugar than does a typical buyer in the world market; that he, in fact, subsidizes foreign sugar growers, so that they can continue to sell their goods cheaply everywhere else.

In the meantime, that same American consumer pays an excise tax on refined sugar, which is eventually returned to domestic growers in the form of Government subsidies. Unlike the usual farm subsidies, however, those given to sugar growers are not conditional on land diversion or any other adjustment of resources; all you have to do to qualify is grow sugar.

In a controlled market in which high prices are virtually guaranteed by a quota system, these further subsidies are impossible to justify. Domestic sugar growers are treated to incredible profits in the American market and, on top of that, subsidized to the tune of $90 million by an already cheated American consumer. This is inexcusable.

I should not have to mention that this money can be put to far better use. Indeed, $90 million is equivalent to the funding of the Peace Corps, twice as much as we spend on environment control, four times what we spend on the Foreign Agricultural Service, and eight times what the Federal Government has budgeted for juvenile delinquency control.

I recommend a complete revision of the Sugar Act provisions. Specifically:

First. A reduction to 6 cents a pound of the target price of raw sugar, New York, from its present level of 7 cents. This deduction would be welcome relief to U.S. consumers, amounting to over $200 million annually.

Second. Preferably the elimination of the direct subsidy payment to domestic producers, but, at least, its reduction to $55,000 per grower annually.

Third. A competitive bidding system for foreign sugar suppliers. Under this procedure, the Secretary of Agriculture through the Commodity Credit Corporation would be authorized to purchase all foreign sugar requirements through contracts established by competitive sealed bidding. At least once a year, he would issue a general invitation to all foreign sugar producers to submit bids as to quantity, price and delivery and would accept those determined to be best. Contracts could be for more than 1 year if deemed advisable.

The Secretary would make purchases under these contracts as domestic market conditions require. He would pay the price specified in the contract, sell the sugar into domestic channels at the going U.S. market price, and deposit the difference in the general fund of the U.S. Treasury. All this would be done, of course, without in any way changing the protection U.S. producers now receive.

More important, it would end all discrimination against foreign sugar producers and it would take Congress out of the business of allocating high-priced concessions to certain favored sugar-producing nations. In other words, it would put foreign policy back where it belongs.

In the absence of an increased tariff on foreign sugar—which would add $53 million to the U.S. Treasury while still guaranteeing domestic producers their share of the U.S. market—these reforms seem to me as sound as they are necessary. For too long the Congress has been told that the Sugar Act is too complicated to be understood and too tricky to be tampered with. For too long American consumers have been bilked by these artificial restraints and unnecessary subsidies. The reform should begin here and now. I cast my vote against this bill.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, the American consumers of sugar, the housewife, and the food industries as well, are paying far more for their sugar than is necessary. The sugar quota system artificially raises prices by over 3 cents a pound. The quota system is a hidden tax.

The sugar quota system, which restricts imports from foreign countries and subsidizes the American farmer and processor, has been in existence since 1934, with revisions in 1937 and, more recently, 1948.

The Sugar Act was originally designed to do several things. First, it was designed to insure a stable sugar price in a varying world market at reasonable cost to the consumer. Second, it was designed to allow the United States to aid certain favored nations by allocating them a quota of our sugar needs, along with the subsidy given to quota nations. Finally, the act was supposed to better "national security" and "defense and strategic" considerations by subsidizing American farmers, by insuring that they get a large share in the sugar production needs of the United States.

For these reasons, the sugar program has established an elaborate and nearly incomprehensible system whereby only certain countries are allowed to trade in sugar with the United States, and then only in fixed quantities of raw sugar. In addition, U.S. producers are given "conditional payments" to subsidize them. These payments averaged, between 1948–68, 0.66 cents on every pound of sugar produced in the United States.

This system which tries to touch so many fields in a normally simple economic matter of supply and demand is paid for at great cost by the American consumer. The American consumer pays more for his sugar than any consumer in any other nation in the Western Hemisphere.

It is said that our buying of sugar supplies and the subsidy we give each nation we buy from aids underdeveloped sugar-producing nations. However, aid to sugar-producing nations by subsidizing their sugar production is an uncertain and wasteful method of trying to help such countries. Our subsidy, for instance, sometimes goes to the government of the country and sometimes to the private industry. Most of the time it is a combination of the two, but there is no certainty that this subsidy money will be used for industrial development projects. In all too many cases it is pure profit for a special few. Since we cannot control, or even know where our subsidy goes, such a subsidy cannot be considered as effective foreign aid.

Also, some of the countries we allocate quotas to are not countries normally subject to foreign aid. Australia, Ireland, or South Africa can hardly be considered underdeveloped nations needing foreign aid.

It is also argued that the present system maintains a stable price when the world market goes up and down with surpluses and scarcities in sugar. What is the purpose of a stable price, however, when our price is so much higher than the rest of the Western Hemisphere nations? Canada, for instance, buys its sugar from the world market, and the latest available figure, 1969, shows a Canadian retail value of 8.8 American cents a pound, while the U.S. figure is 12.2 cents a pound. In fact, since 1962, the Canadian retail value has exceeded the U.S. retail value only once. Is a high stable sugar cost worth the 3.3 cents difference between our system and a possible world market price?

A reasonable system would be to determine foreign sugar sources by competitive bidding. No longer would politically

favored persons in favored nations hold a monopoly on foreign production of sugar for the United States, at a high price. No longer would expensive lobbyists have to be employed in Congress by such nations to try to maintain or increase their quota. No longer would the United States have to pay for sugar at a much higher price than the going world rate.

The determination of our foreign sugar supplies should not be used as a spoils system for specially favored producers at home or abroad. This system sets the stage for corrupt political actions at the expense of the American consumer.

I oppose the Sugar Act amendments now before the House and I strongly urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to voice my fervent opposition to H.R. 8866 which can only serve to further South Africa's apartheid policy. At a time when our own Government is endeavoring to fulfill its commitment to black America, the enactment of a measure to import 60,000 tons of sugar yearly at double the world market price can only be disastrous.

We cannot expect black Americans to have faith in a government that grants economic aid to South Africa, a nation whose economy thrives on the oppression of its black population. Moreover, H.R. 8866 violates the Foreign Assistance Act which stipulates that aid shall not be granted to any nation practicing racial or religious discrimination.

To turn to the more pragmatic economic question, one wonders how we can justify the purchase of a commodity at double the world market value since South Africa, who is rich in diamonds and gold, does not qualify as a nation in need of $5 million for development. I trust U.S. dollars could be better spent in younger, less fortunate and fertile areas of the third world.

It is unfortunate that the urging of the UAW, the black caucus, the Board of Christian Education, the National Council of Churches, as well as thousands of concerned citizens, were not listened to. The passage of H.R. 8866 can only reaffirm charges of U.S. hypocrisy, destroy domestic efforts with our own black community, and most important, wastes millions of dollars in aid. H.R. 8866 demonstrates our Nation's intent to allow the continuing apartheid policy of oppression in South Africa.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, the extension of the Sugar Act of 1948 which we are considering today is a proven mechanism for assuring the continued health of our vital sugar industry at home while providing for controlled importation on a fair basis from foreign sugar producers.

To a remarkable degree this act has succeeded in achieving an adequate supply of sugar at reasonable prices; has maintained the domestic sugar industry; and has promoted the export trade of the United States.

During the 35 years in which the present law has been in force, abundant supplies of sugar have been available to consumers at fair and reasonable prices. A vigorous sugar industry has developed within our national borders, while at the same time insuring large imports in the spirit of free trade. At a time when protectionism is again raising its head in Congress, the Sugar Act stands almost alone as a monument to orderly world trade which keeps domestic prices down, keeps the domestic industry healthy, and insures an adequate U.S. market for foreign producers whose economies depend on the U.S. sugar market.

There have been social gains, too, notably in the improvement of wages and working conditions of farm laborers.

Finally, the sugar program has put more than half a billion dollars into the U.S. Treasury.

Sugar is a basic commodity of the food industry, and an adequate supply must be insured without flooding the market, causing the surpluses and severe price fluctuations which would result from an uncontrolled supply. Under this act, the Secretary of Agriculture in the fourth quarter of each year estimates the consumption of sugar in the United States for the year ahead. Once the consumption estimate is determined, the total amount of sugar it represents is allocated among domestic and foreign sources of supply by a formula prescribed in the act. This orderly operation of a quota system implies the existence of controls to prevent any area from usurping more than its share of the market. Control over foreign supplies is relatively simple in that they are regulated by weight at the point of entry. The point of entry inspection also serves to prevent importation of sugar from nonquota countries.

In the case of domestic production other stabilization procedures are used. If it appears that production in any domestic area will so far exceed its quota that disorderly marketing is likely to result, or that all sellers will not have an equal opportunity to market their fair share of production, the Secretary of Agriculture may impose marketing allotments and apportion the area quota among individual companies within that section.

Although critics of the sugar industry contrast the world market with the domestic market and blame the differential on the Sugar Act, it must be understood that the "free market" prices bear no relation to true economic values and are generally the result of "dumping" which often pegs prices below production costs.

This bill has applied several general criteria to each nation coming within the quota importation. The committee recognizes that these criteria are subjective in nature, but they do reflect the general standards which are necessary and which I support.

First, the government must be friendly to the United States and not impose discrimination against U.S. citizens. In cases of expropriation of U.S.-owned properties, indemnification must be provided.

Second, the country must be a dependable source of sugar supply as reflected by the country's history in supplying the U.S. market, its maintenance of sugar inventories, and its potential for supplying additional sugar upon call during critical periods of short supply.

Third, there must be reciprocal trade as reflected by purchases of U.S. products and services, as contrasted with sales to the United States and also by government treatment of imports from the United States.

Fourth, the quota must reflect the need of the country for a premium priced market in the United States including reference to the extent it shares in other premium priced markets, its relative dependence on sugar as a source of foreign exchange, and its present stage of and need for economic development.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8866, to extend the Sugar Act of 1948 for another 3 years. I do so because, as a member of the Agriculture Committee and having listened attentively to the witnesses at the hearings, I am convinced that the merits of the bill far outdistance the shortcomings and drawbacks.

The announced purposes of the Sugar Act are to protect the consumer by making available a ready supply of sugar at a stable price and to preserve the sugar-producing potential in the continental United States by protecting American sugar farmers from foreign sugar imports with which they could not compete. That the law has been successful in the past, despite criticism and antagonism from the uninformed, is self-evident to the housewife and sugar users who know from personal experience that the price of sugar has increased less than any other food products. That the sugar bill is a matter of national defense should be obvious to those who have lived through a declared war and remember the days of sugar rationing. By preserving the American sugar-growing industry, we preserve a necessity of life and a proven tremendous morale booster in times of trial.

Much has been said today about foreign quotas, but I am primarily interested in mainland cane-growing quotas, the provision for new expansion, and the maintenance of a dependable secondary source of sugar from foreign imports.

Our mainland cane-sugar areas, the States of Louisiana and Florida, are given an additional quota of 300,000 tons, plus an allowance of 100,000 tons for new acreage. This is not a great amount, but it is what the mainland growers asked for and what they assured the commitee that they could fulfill. I would much rather that our cane and sugar beet farmers in the United States had been given the entire sugar production based on our domestic needs; but such feelings would be folly for our needs could not be met, which then would make it necessary to import sugar to meet our needs.

As for the foreign sugar quotas, I feel confident that every informed Member is aware that the foreign recipients and their quotas were designated at the pleasure and suggestion of the State Department and the President and his administration. Sweetness can be used as a diplomatic tool to influence friends and also discourage antagonists.

I do feel that it is unfortunate at a time when we are considering a bill to stabilize food prices, a few should inject into the debates the domestic policies

of one of our more friendly nations and play politics by trying to swap off the South African sugar quota for bloc votes in their congressional district.

On several occasions, we heard comments that the South African Government was guilty of apartheid. I can only say, "So what?" If the people of that country feel that separate development of their races is essential to law and order in their country, then that is their business—not ours.

After all, those of us in the United States can claim little expertise or rational maturity under our hypocritical system of full equality. All any foreign nation would need do is to read our newspapers or follow our communication releases to understand that our system is intolerable and growing worse.

Statements were made here today attacking the terrorism law as if something were wrong with a civilized people who are defending their law-abiding citizens from terrorism, murder, and violence. It may well be that today's antagonists of South Africa may tomorrow realize that they will be forced to support an anti-terrorism law in the United States.

After all, saving the country is the first and primary duty of any responsible government.

Comments were also made today that Members of this body, American citizens, had been denied visa to visit the Republic of South Africa. I feel that the remarks were misleading. South Africa did not discriminate by denying visas to American citizens. But, she did not give preferential treatment to any Members of this body simply because they were U.S. Congressmen by allowing them to enter South Africa and take an activist role in interfering with the domestic affairs and laws of that nation.

I think that the record both at the State Department and in the news reports indicates quite clearly that the supposedly aggrieved Members were offered visas to visit South Africa provided they acted as would be expected of any other American citizen visiting in any other foreign country and would not address public meetings or attempt to hold quasi-hearings for the purpose of furthering their political career using the government of their host country.

Certainly the South African request, in offering to grant visas, did not seem out of line or unreasonable. I know of no other country in Europe, Africa, or Asia that would grant unrestricted visas to any American politician to visit their land for the preannounced purpose of creating confusion, division, and distrust. In fact, all Americans who understand the need to maintain friendly relations between countries were aggrieved by the uncalled-for efforts of a few to turn public opinion in South Africa against the American people merely to satisfy their own personal political goals and desire for publicity.

The South Africans have been our allies in every war. The majority of the Caucasians are descendants of the Western European culture and of the same stock as many of us in the United States. They are a Christian nation, a bulwark against communism and aggression, and have always proved to be a friend of the American people.

The black Africans who live in South Africa enjoy the highest standard of living and modern conveniences of any blacks on the African continent. The South Africans report that they have no law which prevents any South African from leaving the country; rather, they have laws to try to prevent the many disenchanted blacks from other revolutionary societies and emerging states and nations from overcrowding their country. If the plight of the South African black even approached the status of degradation and desperation that now has been suggested here today, certainly it would not be necessary for the South Africans to try to keep millions of new blacks from immigrating into their country.

Finally, the remarks of the chairman of the African Subcommittee that he had twice been denied visas to South Africa raises the question as to whether or not he was including the incident which occurred last fall. At that time, we understand the chairman had been visiting on a taxpayers' junket in Madagascar, where he found little comfort for his hatred for the whites in South Africa. The Madagascar blacks trade with South Africa, and the two countries exchange diplomats and are working together as Africans to solve any problems and differences that may exist. The African Subcommittee chairman was forced to fly to Johannesburg for plane connections, where he had a delay en route. The U.S. Ambassador to South Africa had prearranged with the South African Government to invite him to the U.S. Embassy for entertainment. This necessarily meant traveling in South African by prearranged courtesy of the South African Government. The offer was declined by the chairman. It seems that many times those who shriek discrimination, prejudice, and racism are guilty of having made the bed in which they lie and are only interested in aggravating problems rather than moving forward with solutions. After all is said and done, what does apartheid have to do with the ability of South Africa to be a dependable source of sugar for the American people. People—not countries—produce sugar.

I intend to cast my people's vote in favor of the sugar bill and urge other Members to do the same.

Mr. BERGLAND. Mr. Chairman, with the bill to extend the Sugar Act for 3 years, H.R. 8866, under consideration on the floor today I wish to submit for the record my wholehearted support for the final version of this bill as it relates to our own Nation's sugar industry. My enthusiasm stems from the benefits this bill incorporates for this industry. Additional acreage for the domestic sugar grower—provided for under the bill—will boost economically many areas of our Nation which are feeling the impact of our faltering economy.

Although foreign sugar quotas were rearranged to increase the allotments to small, emerging nations with a sugar producing potential, the ratio between quotas for domestic and foreign producers will remain the same. Domestic producers will provide 7,055,000 tons, or about 62 percent, of our annual consumption of 11.2 million tons.

While the ratio between quotas for domestic and foreign producers will remain the same, the sugar consumption rate is increasing and consequently additional acreage will be added to that already in production within our own United States.

The 3-year extension of the Sugar Act includes about 60,000 additional acres for sugar beet production during the first year of the program because, as previously stated, of a growing market. An additional 45,000 to 60,000 acre annual increase can be expected during the final 2 years of the program.

While working on the legislation in the Agriculture Committee, my top priority was to guarantee substantial increases in sugar beet acreage for the United States. Now that these increases have been approved, beet growers and processors have the assurances they need to plan and finance the expansion of their industry. It is now up to our growers, processors, and communities to take the initiative, and to insure that the industry grows to its fullest potential. I am hopeful that such will be the case in my own seventh District in Minnesota in the Red River Valley area.

Through the new quotas to friendly governments and the encouragements to the industry in America, H.R. 8866 fulfills two of the major purposes of the sugar program since its establishment in 1934.

Mr. Chairman, it also fulfills the third purpose: "to assure to U.S. consumers a plentiful supply of sugar at reasonable prices." Sugar has been, and remains, one of the consumers greatest bargains. While the consumer price index for food has jumped 38.4 points in the last 15 years, the cost of sugar has risen only 2½ cents per pound. There has been much criticism, of late, on our sugar program and the price of sugar on the world market. The fact remains that the price paid by the American consumer is well below the world average. Furthermore, because of this program, we can always count on an adequate supply of sugar on the grocers' shelves.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment.

The bill is as follows:

H.R. 8866

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Sugar Act Amendments of 1971".

SEC. 2. Section 101 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended—

(1) by adding a new subsection (p) as follows:

"(p) The term 'mainland cane sugar area' means the States of Florida and Louisiana."; and

(2) by striking out subsection (j) the words "the Virgin Islands,".

SEC. 3. Section 201 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended:

(1) by striking out the first sentence and substituting the following: "The Secretary shall determine for each calendar year, beginning with the calendar year 1972, the amount of sugar needed to meet the require-

ments of consumers in the continental United States. Such determination shall be made during October of the year preceding the calendar year for which the determination is being made, and at such other times thereafter as may be required to attain the price objective pursuant to the formula set forth herein.";

(2) by striking out of the second sentence "September 30" and substituting "August 31";

(3) by changing the period at the end of the second sentence to a colon and adding the following: *"Provided*, That notwithstanding the foregoing, beginning with the month of January 1972, the price objective shall be a price for raw sugar which would maintain the same ratio between such price and the average of the parity index (1967=100) and the wholesale price index (1967=100) as the ratio that existed between (i) the simple average of the monthly price objective calculated for the period September 1, 1970, through August 31, 1971, under section 201 of the Act in effect immediately prior to the date of enactment of the Sugar Act Amendments of 1971, and (ii) the simple average of such two indexes for the same period."; and

(4) by adding at the end of the section a sentence as follows: "The term 'wholesale price index' as used herein shall mean such index as determined monthly by the United States Department of Labor."

SEC. 4. Section 202 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) (1) For domestic sugar-producing areas, by apportioning among such areas seven million fifty-five thousand short tons, raw value, as follows:

"Area:	*Short tons, raw value*
Domestic beet sugar	3,406,000
Mainland cane sugar	1,539,000
Hawaii	1,110,000
Puerto Rico	1,000,000
Total	7,055,000

"(2) To or from the sum of four million nine hundred and forty-five thousand short tons, raw value, of the quotas for the domestic beet sugar and mainland cane sugar areas there shall be added or deducted, as the case may be, an amount equal to 65 per centum of the amount by which the Secretary's determination of requirements of consumers in the continental United States pursuant to section 201 for the calendar year is greater than or less than eleven million two hundred thousand short tons, raw value. Such amount shall be apportioned between the domestic beet sugar area and the mainland cane sugar area on the basis of the quotas for such areas established under paragraph (1) of this subsection in effect immediately prior to the date of enactment of the Sugar Act Amendments of 1971.

"(3) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection—

"(A) For the calendar years 1972 and 1973 the quota for Puerto Rico shall be eight hundred and fifty-five thousand short tons, raw value, subject to the provisions of subparagraph (B) of this paragraph (3).

"(B) Whenever the production of sugar in Hawaii or Puerto Rico in any year results in there being available for marketing in the continental United States in any year sugar in excess of the quota for such area for such year established under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the quota for the immediately following year established for such area under paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be increased to the extent of such excess production: *Provided*, That in no event shall the quota for Hawaii or Puerto Rico, as so increased, exceed the quota which would have been established for such area at the same level needed to meet the requirements of consumers under the provisions of section 202(a) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, in effect immediately prior to the date of enactment of the Sugar Act Amendments of 1962: *Provided further*, That sugar which is produced in Hawaii or Puerto Rico in any year and which is prevented from being marketed or brought into the continental United States in that year for reasons beyond the control of the producer or the shipper of such sugar shall, within the limitations of the foregoing proviso and section 207, and in addition to the quota which would otherwise be established under section 202, be permitted to be marketed or brought into the continental United States in the next calendar year, except that such amount of sugar which is permitted to be marketed under this proviso shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount of such sugar which has been sold to any other nation instead of being held for marketing in the continental United States."

"(4) Beginning with 1973 or as soon thereafter as the quota or quotas can be used, there shall be established for any new continental cane sugar producing area or areas a quota or quotas of not to exceed a total for all such areas of one hundred thousand short tons, raw value, subject to the requirements of section 302 of this Act."

(2) Subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For the Republic of the Philippines in the amount of one million one hundred twenty-six thousand and twenty short tons, raw value."

(3) Subsection (c) is amended:

(i) by striking out paragraph (2);

(ii) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

"(3) For individual foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines and Ireland, by prorating the amount of sugar determined under paragraph (1) of this subsection, less the amount required to establish a quota as provided in paragraph (4) of this subsection for Ireland, among foreign countries on the following basis:

"(A) For countries in the Western Hemisphere:

"Country:	*Per centum*
Cuba	23.74
Mexico	11.38
Brazil	11.13
Dominican Republic	11.13
Peru	8.87
West Indies	4.07
Ecuador	1.71
Argentina	1.61
Colombia	1.56
Costa Rica	1.38
Nicaragua	1.38
Panama	1.35
Guatemala	1.17
El Salvador	0.85
Venezuela	0.78
Bahamas	0.71
British Honduras	0.71
Haiti	0.65
Bolivia	0.36
Honduras	0.36
Paraguay	0.32

"(B) For countries outside the Western Hemisphere:

"Country:	*Per centum*
Australia	4.92
Republic of China	2.05
India	1.97
South Africa	1.44
Fiji	1.07
Mauritius	0.72
Swaziland	0.72
Thailand	0.45
Malagasy Republic	0.36
Malawi	0.36
Rhodesia	0.36
Uganda	0.36

"(C) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (A) and (B), for the calendar year 1972 the proration for Panama shall be 0.88 per centum and for Malawi shall be zero per centum and the prorations for the other countries named in paragraphs (A) and (B) shall be increased proportionately."; and

(iii) by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

"(4) For Ireland, in the amount of five thousand three hundred and fifty-one short tons, raw value, of sugar."

(4) Subsection (d) is amended as follows:

(i) by amending paragraph (1) (A) to read as follows:

"(1) (A) During the current period of suspension of diplomatic relations between the United States and Cuba, the quota provided for Cuba under subsection (c) shall be withheld and a quantity of sugar equal to such quota shall be prorated to other foreign countries named in paragraph (3) of subsection (c) on the basis of the percentages stated therein.":

(ii) by striking out the words "the Bahama Islands, Bolivia, Honduras, and" in paragraph (3);

(iii) by striking out the word "August" and substituting the word "June" in paragraph (4); and

(iv) by striking out "1965" each time it appears in paragraph (6) and inserting in lieu thereof "1971".

(5) Subsection (e) is amended by inserting after the words "subsection (d) (1) of this section," the words "or subsection 408(c) of this Act,".

(6) Subsection (f) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) Whenever any quota is required to be reduced pursuant to subsection (e) or because of a reduction in the requirements of consumers under section 201 of this Act, and the amount of sugar imported from any country or marketed from any area at the time of such reduction exceeds the reduced quota, the amount of such excess shall, notwithstanding any other provision of this section, be charged to the quota established for such country or domestic area for the next succeeding calendar year. Sugar from any country which at the time of reduction in quota has not been imported but is covered by authorizations for importation issued by the Secretary not more than five days prior to the scheduled date of departure shown on the authorization shall be permitted to be entered and charged to the quota established for such country for the next succeeding calendar year."

(7) Subsection (g) is amended to read as follows:

"(g) (1) The Secretary is authorized to limit, on a quarterly basis only, the importation of sugar within the quota for any foreign country during the first quarter of 1972 if he determines that such limitation is necessary to achieve the objectives of the Act.

"(2) The Secretary shall not be authorized during the last three quarters of 1972 and the full year 1973, or in any year thereafter except as provided herein, to limit the importation of sugar within the quota for any foreign country through the use of limitations applied on other than a calendar year basis.

"(3) In order to attain on an annual average basis the price objective determined pursuant to the formula specified in section 201 of this Act, the Secretary shall make adjustments in the determination of requirements of consumers in accordance with the following provisions: (i) the determination of requirements of consumers shall not be adjusted whenever the simple average of the prices of raw sugar for seven consecutive market days is less than 4 per centum above or below the average price objective so determined for the preceding two calendar months; (ii) the determination of requirements of consumers shall be adjusted to the extent necessary to attain such price objective whenever the simple average of prices of raw sugar for seven consecutive market days is 4 per centum or more above or below the average price objective so determined for the

preceding two calendar months; and (iii) the determination of requirements of consumers for the current year shall not be reduced after November 30 of such year, but any required reduction shall instead be made in such determination for the following year. If in the twelve-month period ending October 31 of any year after 1972 the average price of raw sugar is less than 99 per centum of the price objective determined pursuant to the formula set forth in section 201 (except in the twelve-month period ending October 31, 1973—97 per centum) then, with respect to each subsequent quota year, the Secretary is authorized after November 30 of the preceding year to limit, on a quarterly basis only, the importation of sugar within the quota of any foreign country during the first or second quarter, or both, of such year if he determines that such limitation is necessary to achieve the objectives of the Act.

"(4) The Secretary shall not be authorized to issue any regulation under this Act restricting the importation, shipment, or storage of sugar to one or more particular geographical areas."

SEC. 5. Sections 204, 205, 206, 207, 209, and 211 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, are amended as follows:

(I) Section 204 is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended as follows:

(i) by changing the first sentence to read as follows: "The Secretary shall, at the time he makes his determination of requirements of consumers for each calendar year and as often thereafter as the facts are ascertainable by him, but in any event not less frequently than each sixty days after the beginning of the quota year, determine whether, in view of the current inventories of sugar, the estimated production from the acreage of sugarcane or sugar beets planted, the normal marketings within a calendar year of new-crop sugar, and other pertinent factors, any area or country will not market the quota for such area or country.";

(ii) by changing the first word of the second sentence from "If" to "Whenever" and by striking out the words "will be unable to" and substituting the words "will not";

(iii) by amending the first proviso in the second sentence to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That any deficit resulting from the inability of a country which is a member of the Central American Common Market to fill its quota or its share of any deficit determined under the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall first be allocated to the other member countries on the basis of the quotas determined pursuant to section 202 for such countries:";

(iv) by striking out of the third, fifth, sixth, and eighth sentences the words "will be unable to" and substituting the words "will not";

(v) by striking out the third and fourth sentences from the end of the subsection and substituting the following: "In determining and allocating deficits the Secretary shall act to provide at all times throughout the calendar year the full distribution of the amount of sugar which he has determined to be needed under section 201 of this Act to meet the requirements of consumers.";

(vi) by striking out "quotas then in effect" wherever it appears in the subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "quotas determined pursuant to section 202";

(vii) by striking out "47.22" wherever it appears therein and substituting "37.6"; and

(2) by adding a new subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section and section 211(c), if the Secretary determines that Hawaii or Puerto Rico will be unable to fill its quota established under section 203 for marketing for local consumption on a day-to-day basis, he shall allocate an amount of sugar not in excess of such deficit to the domestic beet sugar area or the mainland cane sugar area to be filled by direct consumption or raw sugar, as he determines to be required for local consumption."

(II) Section 205 is amended by amending the third sentence of subsection (a) to read as follows: "The Secretary is authorized in making such allotments, whenever there is involved any allotment that pertains to a new or substantially enlarged existing sugar beet processing facility serving a locality or localities which have received an acreage allotment under section 302(b)(3), to take into consideration in lieu of or in addition to the foregoing factors of processing, past marketings and ability to market, the need for establishing an allotment which will permit such marketing of sugar as is necessary for reasonably efficient operation of any such new or substantially enlarged sugar beet processing facility during each the first three years of its operation."

(III) Section 206 is amended by amending subsections (a) and (b) to read as follows:

"(a) If the Secretary determines that the prospective importation or bringing into the continental United States, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico of any sugar containing product or mixture or beet sugar molasses will substantially interfere with the attainment of the objectives of this Act, he may limit the quantity of such product, mixture, or beet sugar molasses to be imported or brought in from any country or area to a quantity which he determines will not so interfere: *Provided*, That the quantity to be imported or brought in from any country or area in any calendar year shall not be reduced below the average of the quantities of such product, mixture, or beet sugar molasses annually imported or brought in during such three-year period as he may select for which reliable data of the importation or bringing in of such product, mixture, or beet sugar molasses are available.

"(b) In the event the Secretary determines that the prospective importation or bringing into the continental United States, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, of any sugar-containing product or mixture or beet sugar molasses will substantially interfere with the attainment of the objectives of this Act and there are no reliable data available of such importation or bringing in of such product, mixture, or beet sugar molasses for three consecutive years, he may limit the quantity of such product, mixture, or beet sugar molasses to be imported or brought in annually from any country or area to a quantity which the Secretary determines will not substantially interfere with the attainment of the objectives of the Act: *Provided*, That, in the case of a sugar-containing product or mixture, such quantity from any one country or area shall not be less than a quantity containing one hundred short tons, raw value of sugar or liquid sugar."

(IV) Section 207 is amended:

(1) by deleting "such" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "the preceding"; and

(2) by changing subsection (b) to read as follows: "(b) The quota for Puerto Rico established under section 202 for any calendar year may be filled by direct-consumption sugar not to exceed an amount equal to 1.5 per centum of the first eleven million short tons, raw value, of the Secretary's determination for the preceding year issued pursuant to section 201, plus 0.5 per centum of any amount of such determination above eleven million short tons, raw value: *Provided*, That one hundred and twenty-six thousand and thirty-three short tons, raw value, of such direct-consumption sugar shall be principally of crystalline structure."; and

(3) by striking out subsection (c).

(V) Section 209(a) is amended by striking out the words "the Virgin Islands," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "any areas".

(VI) Section 211 is amended by striking out of subsection (a) the words "continental United States" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "United States, including Puerto Rico,".

(VII) Section 212 is amended by striking out "sugar or liquid" and substituting "direct consumption sugar or liquid", in clauses (1) and (2).

SEC. 6. Title III of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended as follows:

(I) Section 302 is amended:

(1) by adding at the end of paragraph (2) of subsection (b) the following: "The personal sugar beet production history of a farm operator who dies, or becomes incapacitated, shall accrue to the legal representative of his estate or to a member of his immediate family if such legal representative or family member continues within three years of such death or incapacity the customary sugar beet operations of the deceased or incapacitated operator. If in any year during this period sugar beets were not planted by such legal representative or member of the family, production history shall be credited to such year equal to the acreage last planted by the deceased or incapacitated farm operator.";

(2) by amending paragraph (3) of subsection (b) to read as follows: "(3) In order to make acreage available for growth and expansion of the beet sugar industry, the Secretary, in addition to protecting the interests of new and small producers by regulations generally similar to those heretofore promulgated by him pursuant to this Act, shall allocate each year as needed from the national sugar beet requirements established by him, during the extension of this Act, the acreage required to yield not more than 100,000 short tons, raw value, of sugar for localities to be served by new or substantially enlarged existing sugar beet processing facilities. Priority shall be given to processing facilities located or to be located in or adjacent to growing areas where processing facilities were closed during 1970 or thereafter. Allocations shall be for a period of three years and limited for any one processing facility to the acreage required to yield a maximum of 50,000 short tons, raw value, of sugar and a minimum of 25,000 short tons, raw value, of sugar each year. The acreage so allocated shall be distributed on a fair and reasonable basis to new and old sugar beet farms to the extent that it can be utilized without regard to any other acreage allocations to States determined by the Secretary. At the time the Secretary allocates acreage for a new or substantially enlarged existing sugar beet processing facility for any year, which determination shall be made as far in advance of such year as practicable, such allocation shall thereby be committed to be in effect for the year in which production of sugar beets is scheduled to commence or to be substantially increased in the locality or localities determined by the Secretary to receive such acreage allocation for such year, such determination by the Secretary shall be final, and such commitment of acreage allocation shall be irrevocable upon issuance of such determination of the Secretary by publication in the Federal Register; except that if the Secretary finds in any case that the construction of new or the substantial enlargement of existing sugar beet processing facilities and the contracting for processing of sugar beets has not proceeded in substantial accordance with the representations made to him as a basis for his determination of acreage allocation, he shall revoke such determination in accordance with and upon publication in the Federal Register of such findings. In determining acreage allocations for a locality or localities serving new or substantially enlarged existing sugar beet facilities and whenever proposals are made to construct new or to substantially enlarge existing sugar beet processing facilities in two or more

localities (where sugar beet production is scheduled to commence or to be substantially increased in the same year), the Secretary shall base his determination and selection upon the firmness of capital commitment, the proven suitability of the area for growing sugar beets and the relative qualifications of localities and proposals under such criteria. If proportionate shares are in effect in either of the two years immediately following the year for which such initial acreage allocation is made in any locality, the Secretary shall adjust the initial allocation in the same proporton as the State's acreage is adjusted from its acreage of the year in which such initial allocation was made";

(3) by amending paragraph (4) of subsection (b) to read as follows: "(4) The allocation of the national sugar beet acreage requirement to States for sugar beet production, as well as the acreage allocation for new or substantially enlarged existing sugar beet processing facilities, shall be determined by the Secretary after investigation and notice and opportunity for an informal public hearing.";

(4) by deleting from paragraph (5) of subsection (b) "in any local producing area";

(5) by adding at the end of subsection (b) a new paragraph as follows:

"(10) The Secretary shall credit to the farm of any producer (or to the producer in a personal history State) who has lost a market for sugar beets as a result of (i) the closing of a sugar beet factory in any crop year after 1970; (ii) the complete discontinuance of contracting by a processor after 1970 in a State; or (iii) the discontinuance of contracting by a processor after 1970 in a substantial portion of a State in which the processor contracted a total of at least four thousand acres of the 1970 crop of sugar beets, an acreage history (or production history) for each of the next three years equal to the average acreage planted on the farm (or by the producer) in the last three years of such factory's operation or processor's contracting, and any unused proportionate share shall not be transferred to other farms (or producers)."; and

(6) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

"(c) In order to enable any new cane sugar producing area to fill the quota to be established for such area under section 202 (a)(4), the Secretary shall allocate an acreage which he determines is necessary to enable the area to meet its quota and provide a normal carryover inventory. Such acreage shall be fairly and equitably distributed to farms on the basis of land, labor, and equipment available for the production of sugarcane, and the soil and other physical factors affecting the production of sugarcane. The acreage allocation for any year shall be made as far in advance of such year as practicable, and the commitment of such acreage to the area shall be irrevocable upon issuance of such determination by publication thereof in the Federal Register; *Provided*, That if the Secretary finds in any case that construction of sugarcane facilities and the contracting for processing of sugarcane has not proceeded in substantial accordance with the representation made to him as a basis for his determination of distribution of acreage, he shall revoke such determination in accordance with and upon publication in the Federal Register of such findings. In making his determination for the establishment of a quota and the allocation of the acreage required in connection with such quota, the Secretary shall base such determination upon the firmness of capital commitment and the suitability of the area for growing sugarcane and, where two or more areas are involved, the relative qualification of such areas under such criteria. If proportionate shares are in effect in such area in the two years immediately following the year for which the sugarcane acreage allocation is committed for any area, the total acreage of proportionate shares established for farms in such area in each such two years, shall not be less than the larger of the acreage committed to such area or the acreage which the Secretary determines to be required to enable the area to fill its quota and provide for a normal carryover inventory."

(II) Section 303 is amended by striking out the words "which cause such damage to all or a substantial part of the crop of sugar beets or sugarcane in the same factory district (as established by the Secretary), county, parish, municipality, or local producing areas,".

(III) Section 307 is amended to read as follows: "This title shall apply to the continental United States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico."

SEC. 7. Title IV of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended as follows:

(I) Section 404 is amended by changing the period at the end of the first sentence to a comma and adding the following: "and, except as provided in sections 205 and 306 of this Act, to review in accordance with 5 U.S.C., chapter 7, any regulation issued pursuant to this Act."

(II) Section 408 is amended by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

"(c) In any case in which a nation or a political subdivision thereof has hereafter (1) nationalized, expropriated, or otherwise seized the ownership or control of the property or business enterprise owned or controlled by United States citizens or any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens or (2) imposed upon or enforced against such property or business enterprise so owned or controlled, discriminatory taxes or other exactions, or restrictive maintenance or operational conditions (including limiting or reducing participation in production, export, or sale of sugar to the United States under quota allocation pursuant to this Act) not imposed or enforced with respect to the property or business enterprise of a like nature owned or operated by its own nationals or the nationals of any government other than the Government of the United States or (3) imposed upon or enforced against such property or business enterprise so owned or controlled, discriminatory taxes or other exactions, or restrictive maintenance or operational conditions (including limiting or reducing partcipation in production, export, or sale of sugar to the United States under quota allocation pursuant to this Act), or has taken other actions, which have the effect of nationalizing, expropriating or otherwise seizing ownership or control of such property or business enterprise or (4) violated the provisions of any bilateral or multilateral international agreement to which the United States is a party, designed to protect such property or business enterprise so owned or controlled, and has failed within six months following the taking of action in any of the above categories to take appropriate and adequate steps to remedy such situation and to discharge its obligations under international law toward such citizen or entity, including the prompt payment to the owner or owners of such property or business enterprise so nationalized, expropriated or otherwise seized or to provide relief from such taxes, exactions, conditions or breaches of such international agreements, as the case may be, or to arrange, with the agreement of the parties concerned, for submitting the question in dispute to arbitration or conciliation in accordance with procedures under which final and binding decision or settlement will be reached and full payment or arrangements with the owners for such payment made within twelve months following such submission, the President may withhold or suspend all or any part of any quota, proration of quota, or authorization to import sugar under this Act of such nation, and either in addition or as an alternative, the President may, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, cause to be levied and collected at the port of entry an impost on any or all sugar sought to be imported into the United States under the quota of such nation established pursuant to this Act in an amount not to exceed $20 per ton, such moneys to be covered into the Treasury of the United States into a special trust fund, and he shall use such fund to make payment of claims arising subsequent to January 1, 1969, as a result of such nationalization, expropriation, or other type seizure or action set forth herein, except that if such nation participates in the quota for the West Indies, the President may suspend a portion of the quota, or proration of the quota, for the West Indies which is not in excess of the quantity shipped from that nation during the preceding year, until he is satisfied that appropriate steps are being taken, and either in addition or as an alternative, he may cause to be levied and collected an impost on any or all sugar sought to be imported into the United States under the quota of such nation for the payment of claims as provided herein. Any quantity so withheld or suspended shall be allocated under section 202(d)(1)(B) of this Act."

(III) Section 412 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 412. The powers vested in the Secretary under this Act shall terminate on December 31, 1974, or March 31 of the year of termination of the sugar excise tax imposed under section 4501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code as amended, whichever is the earlier date, except that the Secretary shall have power to make payments under title III under programs applicable to the crop year in which the date of termination occurs and previous crop years."

SEC. 8. Section 4501(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended as follows:

(1) by striking out of the first sentence the words "June 30, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "June 30, 1975, or June 30 of the year immediately following the effective date of any law limiting payments under title III of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, whichever is the earlier date"; and

(2) by striking out of the second sentence the phrase "June 30, 1972, or with respect to sugar or articles composed in chief value of sugar held in customs custody or control on such date" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "June 30, 1975, or June 30 of the year immediately following the effective date of any law limiting payments under title III of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, whichever is the earlier date, or with respect to sugar or articles composed in chief value of sugar held in customs custody or control on such earlier date.".

SEC. 9. Except as herein provided, the provisions of this Act shall be effective January 1, 1972. The amendments made by sections 3 and 4 of this Act, and the amendment made to section 204 by section 5 of this Act, shall be effective upon the date of enactment of this Act for purposes of actions relating to the 1972 and subsequent quota years.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendments are in order to the bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Agriculture.

Are there any committee amendments?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, there are no such amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair,

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8866), to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 471, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GOODLING

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

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GOODLING. I am, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GOODLING moves to recommit the bill H.R. 8866 to the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

The motion to recommit was rejected.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 229, nays 128, not voting 76, as follows:

[Roll No. 130]

YEAS—229

Abbitt	Burton	Foley
Abernethy	Byrne, Pa.	Ford, Gerald R.
Abourezk	Byrnes, Wis.	Fountain
Adams	Cabell	Frenzel
Addabbo	Caffery	Fuqua
Alexander	Carey, N.Y.	Galifianakis
Andrews, Ala.	Carter	Gallagher
Andrews, N. Dak.	Casey, Tex.	Garmatz
	Cederberg	Gaydos
Arends	Chamberlain	Gettys
Aspinall	Chappell	Giaimo
Baker	Collier	Gonzalez
Baring	Collins, Tex.	Grasso
Barrett	Colmer	Gray
Begich	Corman	Green, Oreg.
Belcher	Daniels, N.J.	Gubser
Bennett	Danielson	Hagan
Bergland	Davis, Ga.	Hamilton
Betts	Davis, S.C.	Hammer-schmidt
Bevill	de la Garza	
Blanton	Delaney	Hanley
Blatnik	Donohue	Hanna
Boggs	Dorn	Hansen, Wash.
Bow	Dowdy	Harvey
Brasco	Downing	Hathaway
Brinkley	Dwyer	Hébert
Brooks	Esch	Henderson
Brotzman	Evans, Colo.	Hicks, Mass.
Broyhill, Va.	Evins, Tenn.	Hicks, Wash.
Burke, Fla.	Fascell	Hillis
Burke, Mass.	Fisher	Hogan
Burleson, Tex.	Flood	Holifield
Burlison, Mo.	Flynt	Howard
Hull	Montgomery	Shriver
Jarman	Morgan	Sikes
Johnson, Calif.	Moss	Sisk
Johnson, Pa.	Murphy, Ill.	Skubitz
Jones, Ala.	Murphy, N.Y.	Slack
Jones, N.C.	Myers	Smith, Calif.
Jones, Tenn.	Natcher	Smith, Iowa
Karth	Nelsen	Staggers
Kazen	Nichols	Stanton, James V.
Kee	Nix	
Keith	Obey	Steed
Kemp	O'Neill	Steele
Kuykendall	Patman	Steiger, Ariz.
Kyl	Perkins	Steiger, Wis.
Landgrebe	Pickle	Stratton
Latta	Pirnie	Stubblefield
Leggett	Poage	Sullivan
Lennon	Podell	Symington
Link	Poff	Taylor
Lloyd	Powell	Teague, Calif.
Long, La.	Preyer, N.C.	Thone
Lujan	Price, Ill.	Udall
McClure	Price, Tex.	Ullman
McDade	Purcell	Vander Jagt
McFall	Quie	Vigorito
McKay	Rarick	Waggonner
McKevitt	Reid, Ill.	Waldie
McMillan	Rhodes	White
Mahon	Roberts	Whitehurst
Mann	Robinson, Va.	Whitten
Martin	Rodino	Widnall
Mathias, Calif.	Rogers	Williams
Mathis, Ga.	Roncalio	Wilson, Charles H.
Matsunaga	Rooney, N.Y.	
Meeds	Rostenkowski	Winn
Metcalfe	Roush	Wolff
Miller, Calif.	Roy	Wright
Miller, Ohio	Ruth	Wyatt
Mills, Ark.	Sandman	Wyman
Mills, Md.	Satterfield	Yatron
Mink	Scherle	Young, Fla.
Minshall	Schwengel	Young, Tex.
Mizell	Scott	Zion
Mollohan	Sebelius	Zwach
Monagan	Shoup	

NAYS—128

Anderson, Calif.	Eshleman	O'Hara
	Findley	O'Konski
Anderson, Ill.	Ford, William D.	Patten
Annunzio		Pelly
Archer	Fraser	Pettis
Ashley	Frelinghuysen	Pike
Aspin	Fulton, Pa.	Pryor, Ark.
Badillo	Gibbons	Pucinski
Biester	Goodling	Quillen
Bingham	Green, Pa.	Railsback
Boland	Gross	Randall
Brademas	Gude	Rangel
Bray	Haley	Reid, N.Y.
Broomfield	Hall	Reuss
Brown, Mich.	Halpern	Riegle
Broyhill, N.C.	Harrington	Roe
Buchanan	Hawkins	Rosenthal
Byron	Hechler, W. Va.	Rousselot
Chisholm	Helstoski	Ruppe
Clawson, Del	Hungate	Ryan
Clay	Hutchinson	St Germain
Cleveland	Ichord	Sarbanes
Collins, Ill.	Jacobs	Scheuer
Conte	Kastenmeier	Schmitz
Cotter	Keating	Schneebeli
Coughlin	Koch	Seiberling
Crane	Kyros	Shipley
Davis, Wis.	Long, Md.	Snyder
Dellenback	McClory	Spence
Dellums	McCloskey	Stanton, J. William
Dennis	McDonald, Mich.	
Derwinski		Stokes
Devine	McKinney	Thompson, Ga.
Dickinson	Macdonald, Mass.	Thompson, N.J.
Diggs		Thomson, Wis.
Dingell	Madden	Van Deerlin
Dow	Mayne	Vanik
Drinan	Mazzoli	Whalen
Duiski	Michel	Whalley
Duncan	Mikva	Wiggins
du Pont	Minish	Wilson, Bob
Eckhardt	Mitchell	Wylie
Edwards, Calif.	Moorhead	Yates
Eilberg	Mosher	
Erlenborn	Nedzi	

NOT VOTING—76

Abzug	Celler	Edmondson
Anderson, Tenn.	Clancy	Edwards, Ala.
	Clark	Edwards, La.
Ashbrook	Clausen, Don H.	Fish
Bell		Flowers
Biaggi	Conable	Forsythe
Blackburn	Conyers	Frey
Bolling	Culver	Fulton, Tenn.
Brown, Ohio	Daniel, Va.	Goldwater
Camp	Denholm	Griffin
Carney	Dent	Griffiths
Grover	McCormack	Smith, N.Y.
Harsha	McCulloch	Springer
Hansen, Idaho	McEwen	Stafford
Hastings	Mailliard	Stephens
Hays	Melcher	Stuckey
Heckler, Mass.	Morse	Talcott
Horton	Passman	Teague, Tex.
Hosmer	Pepper	Terry
Hunt	Peyser	Tiernan
Jonas	Rees	Veysey
King	Robison, N.Y.	Wampler
Kluczynski	Rooney, Pa.	Ware
Landrum	Roybal	Watts
Lent	Runnels	Wydler
McCollister	Saylor	Zablocki

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Harsha for, with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee against.

Mr. Veysey for, with Mr. Biaggi against.

Mr. Melcher for, with Mr. Forsythe against.

Mr. Kluczynski for, with Mr. Wydler against.

Mr. Griffin for, with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Teague of Texas for, with Mr. Robinson of New York against.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana for, with Mr. Conable against.

Mr. Pepper for, with Mr. Conyers against.

Mr. Passman for, with Mr. Rees against.

Mr. Flowers for, with Mr. Grover against.

Mr. Stephens for, with Mr. Horton against.

Mr. Stuckey for, with Mrs. Abzug against.

Mr. Daniel of Virginia for, with Mr. Saylor against.

Mr. Edwards of Alabama for, with Mr. Hosmer against.

Mr. Hunt for, with Mr. Terry against.

Mr. Watts for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Edmondson for, with Mr. McEwen against.

Mr. Camp for, with Mr. Lent against.

Mr. Landrum for, with Mr. Peyser against.

Mr. Wampler for, with Mr. Hastings against.

Mr. Frey for, with Mr. Fish against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mrs. Griffith with Mr. Stafford.

Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Morse.

Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Ware.

Mr. Roybal with Mr. Goldwater.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Carney with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Blackburn.

Mr. McCormack with Mr. Jonas.

Mr. Denholm with Mr. Clancy.

Mr. Runnels with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Clausen with Mr. McCollister.

Mr. ADAMS 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 8866.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. This concludes the program for this week.

The program for the week of June 14 is as follows:

Monday we will have the customary Flag Day ceremonies.

Monday is also District day, and four bills are scheduled for consideration, as follows:

H.R. 8794, medical services for totally disabled firemen and policemen.

H.R. 2591, amendments to acts affecting public utilities;

H.R. 2592, vacation work permits for minors; and

H.R. 8589, amendment to Healing Arts Practice Act.

The program for Tuesday and the balance of the week is as follows:

Tuesday is Private Calendar day.

Scheduled for consideration are:

H.R. 8687, the military procurement authorization bill, under an open rule with 4 hours of debate;

H.R. 6483, Marine Corps generals appointments, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate;

H.R. 8629, the Health Manpower Training Act, subject to a rule being granted;

H.R. 8630, the Nurse Training Act, subject to a rule being granted; and

H.R. 7736, health professions student loan and scholarship expansion, subject to a rule being granted.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time. It is anticipated that on Tuesday next the conference report on S. 575, the accelerated public works bill, will be brought up.

May I also make note of the fact that next week it is anticipated, unless the work is completed by Thursday night, we will work on Friday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman for reaffirmation of what he has said. The conference report on the accelerated public works bill will be programed at the outset on Tuesday?

Mr. O'NEILL. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. There is a high likelihood or great probability we will have a session on Friday in order to complete the business on the whip notice?

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I ask one other question? Although H.R. 1 is not programed for next week, is it likely it will be on the agenda the following week?

Mr. O'NEILL. It is possible it will be on the agenda the following week. I understand it is being called before the Rules Committee on Tuesday of next week, and the rule should be granted at that time, and it would be possible to have it come up the following week.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. That would be the week of June 21?

Mr. O'NEILL. The week of June 21, yes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the distinguished majority whip.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me address a question to the distinguished majority whip. What are the prospects for rules on the last three bills scheduled for next week?

Mr. O'NEILL. I would say they are excellent from what I understand from the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He said that the bills were reported with only one dissent on one of the bills.

Mr. GROSS. I mean, what are the prospects for rules on these bills, to make them in order next week?

Mr. O'NEILL. We do not anticipate any problem whatsoever.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It is my understanding that the Rules Committee is going to meet on those three proposals on Wednesday in order to clear the docket for consideration on Thursday and Friday.

Mr. O'NEILL. That is right. They are scheduled for consideration by the Rules Committee on Wednesday next.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 14, 1971

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

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. O'NEILL. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE CLOSING OF ANOTHER MAJOR TEXTILE MILL

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

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, once again my district has been hit by the closing of a major textile mill. The closing of Beaunit Mills, in the city of Childersburg, just 10 miles from my home, will leave almost 1,000 persons out of work. An $8 million payroll will also be eliminated. This is the third textile mill in my district to close within the past year; the first two, located in Roanoke, left over 1,200 persons unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of statements to the contrary by the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, I am still hopeful that the 92d Congress can approve a trade bill to limit imports from low-wage countries such as Japan. Officials of Beaunit listed the increase in imports as one of the main reasons for closing the facility which was the last rayon production plant to be built in this country. Imports were also blamed for the two closings in Roanoke.

I am well aware that I am not the only Member in this distinguished body who has had hundreds of constituents lose their livelihood because a trade bill has not been passed. Earlier this week, I sent a copy of an article written by Bill Moyers, former Press Secretary to President Johnson, to the distinguished chairman of the District of Columbia Committee. The article dealt with the numerous problems being faced by a small South Carolina town and its only industry—a textile mill.

Mr. Speaker, I submit three newspaper clippings dealing with the closing of the Beaunit Mills. The first two, from the June 2, 1971, edition of the Talladega Daily Home, show the effects of the closing on Childersburg and all of Talladega County. The third article appeared in the June 3, 1971, edition of the Sylacauga News and is an interview with J. Craig Smith, chairman of the board of Avondale Mills, who explains, from a textile point of view, why the industry is faltering. The reason is simple—the lack of a trade bill. The responsibility for passage of such legislation depends on the 92d Congress.

The material follows:

CLOSING OF THE BEAUNIT MILLS

CHILDERSBURG.—Beaunit Fibers at Childersburg, employing 936 people and with a multi-million dollar payroll will cease operation in late August and the property will be put up for sale, the company said Tuesday.

The official announcement of the closing was made in New York Tuesday afternoon by Paul Luckett, executive vice president of operations for the corporation.

The rumor of the plant's closing hit the county Monday but could not be confirmed that day at the local level.

Luckett said the decision to close the facility in late August was made "after six years of unprofitable operations, with no turnaround in sight."

A source said a survey made by the corporation showed that if Beaunit continued its plant in Childersburg another year, the plant would lose between $2 and 2½ million dollars.

Luckett said a low volume of production, severe import competition, and declining demand for rayon tire cord were strong considerations in closing the plant.

UNEMPLOYMENT RISES AFTER SHUTDOWN OF BEAUNIT MILLS

According to the latest figures available at the state employment service, 23,350 people are employed in the county now. This figure includes the Beaunit work force. An additional 1,290 were listed as unemployed; thus

placing the rate of unemployment at 4.8 per cent based on the total available civilian work force.

Many of those listed as unemployed based on the February figures are in the ranks of those known as the chronic unemployed.

The highest rate of unemployment in the county during recent months was in June of 1970 when 2,070 people were listed as unemployed, a rate of 7.7 per cent.

With the shutdown of Beaunit, the rate of unemployment could rise to about 8 per cent; approaching the 10-year unemployment high for the county in November 1960 when unemployment was 10.2 per cent of the total civilian work force.

AVONDALE EXECUTIVE SAYS TEXTILE IMPORTS CLIMB

Avondale Mills' Chairman of the Board J. Craig Smith, in an exclusive interview with the News this week concerning the closing of Beaunit Mills in Childersburg said that some 50 textile mills located in the Southeast had closed during the past 18 months. He cited the foreign import problem as responsible for the closing of not only these mills, but approximately 70 more in the New England states.

Following is the text of a prepared statement by Smith concerning the continuing import problem:

"The closing of the Beaunit Mill brings the import problem even closer to home than the closing of the Handley Manufacturing Company at Roanoke. Even Americans who have no interest in preserving American jobs may be acting against their own interest in opposing a reasonable restraint on textile imports.

"The American textile industry is the most highly competitive major industry left in the United States. In the case of cotton textiles, our prices are actually less than they were in the government based period of 1947-49. Imports came in last year at the rate of 4½ billion square yards, and so far this year are running 30% ahead of last year. What the American people need to be concerned about is what will happen to textile prices when the American industry is brought to its knees and when a small group will meet in Osaka and both divide the American market and fix their own prices. If the present trend of imports is allowed to continue unabated, this is not only a possibility, but a probability."

GRADUATION AND COMMISSIONING EXERCISES AT THE U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

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

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, it was my distinct privilege to be among those attending the graduation and commissioning exercises at the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis. My one regret was that each and every American who is concerned with the direction of the military in this country could not have been present in the Navy-Marine Corps Memorial Stadium to hear the words of Adm. Elmo R. Zumwalt, chief of naval operations, as he spoke to the 859 graduates of the class of 1971.

The 735 new Navy ensigns, the 117 new Marine Corps second lieutenants, and the seven midshipmen graduates from foreign navies heard Admiral Zumwalt place the role of the military professional in proper perspective, in terms of world conditions, in terms of changing attitudes and priorities in our own society, and in terms of the interpersonal relationships between men of our own Navy which must be forged to keep the morale and the effectiveness of our naval force in step with demands of the times, and with the changing nature and higher sophistication of American men who volunteer for naval service.

Zumwalt, the youngest man yet to serve as Chief of Naval Operations, harkened back to his own graduation from Annapolis 29 years ago and gave new life to the words spoken by then Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Ernest J. King, at the 1942 graduation ceremony. He eloquently pointed out through Admiral King's forward-looking thoughts in his World War II address, how the changes forged in the Navy, in the world and in our own society in the 29 years since his own commencement, would be equalled or surpassed in the 29 years between now and the turn of the 21st century. Admiral Zumwalt sought from the 1971 graduates judgment, intelligent leadership and understanding as the keystones of the kind of Navy we would need to be effective in the new century. While not minimizing the importance of either discipline or tradition, he indicated that neither would carry the day in the modern Navy without effective, discerning, and intelligent leadership and high morale.

As the father of a midshipman and as a Congressman who has followed the progress of each one of my appointees to the Naval Academy, I am closely familiar with the Academy's program and administration. I can say with assurance, Mr. Speaker, that Admiral Zumwalt was not sowing seeds on barren ground as he set the course for the military that must serve the future of a changing America.

A consistent formula of excellence in scholarship and character development, together with understanding of the individuality and creativity of each midshipman, with rational and consistent application of military discipline, and with a tempered metamorphosis of Academy tradition to meet the tone of present-day society—these factors have marked the outstanding program and administration of U.S. Naval Academy Superintendent, Vice Adm. James Calvert, and of the commandant of midshipmen, Rear Adm. Robert Coogan, who moves on to another assignment shortly.

Both Vice Admiral Calvert and Rear Admiral Coogan have, in my judgment, succeeded in turning out Naval Academy graduates who are equal to the task of carrying out the charge and the challenge delivered by Admiral Zumwalt to the class of 1971.

From watching the progress to my two constituent-appointees who graduated yesterday, Wallace J. Wagemaker and Daniel G. Hickey, and from observing the conduct of other midshipmen during my frequent visits to the Academy, I am confident that Admiral Zumwalt's words will take seed in the minds and in the performance of the 859 young men who became commissioned officers yesterday.

I include at this point in the RECORD the full text of Admiral Zumwalt's graduation address:

REMARKS BY ADM. E. R. ZUMWALT, JR.

It is a very great pleasure for me to be here on this occasion—it is a day long awaited by you, and one which will live long among your many memories of Annapolis—I know that you are impatient to take your places alongside the officers of our Navy and Marine Corps—and that you are ready to do so.

Today, you join a long line of predecessors who have made their mark, and I believe you do so at a watershed year in our nation's history.

In 1971, we see a new century lying only 29 years in the future. Members of this class will lead our Navy and Marine Corps into that 21st century, many as flag and general officers bearing great responsibility for its shape, course and state of progress.

In 1971, we also perceive a fundamental shift of attitudes and priorities in our national life—these changes in emphasis within our society will have profound influence on you, the Navy and the Marine Corps which one of you may someday head in the early years of that coming century.

But, you are well-able to respond to these influences, for you have been an integral part of the developing stream of American life during the last two decades. You will meet the challenges ahead by applying judgments forged from your earlier experiences and tempered in the demanding environment of this great institution.

In addition you are fortunate to bring to the Navy perspectives uniquely your own and in many respects considerably different from those of generations past. Your rise to maturity has paralleled the growth of mass communications and educational technology in America and thus, you are able to see the road ahead with more broadly balanced perceptions than any previous generation.

We expect you to make a real impact on the Navy and the nation as you move on to that new century.

What are your statistical prospects during these next three decades?

The class profile can be forecast with reasonable confidence. We already know the basic career choices you have selected.

Eight-hundred-fifty nine of you graduate today. One-hundred-seventeen have chosen the Marine Corps and seven are to be commissioned in other allied navies. For the remainder, we can predict the following:

By 1974, 729 will have been promoted to lieutenant; by 1979, 421 will achieve the rank of lieutenant commander. In that year, your choice of career channels will have become final, and there will be among you 147 surface warfare officers, 87 naval aviators and flight officers, 93 submarine officers, 35 engineering duty specialists, 17 civil engineering officers, and 29 supply corps officers.

Of those who remain in the line, 325 will have completed post-graduate training.

By 1985, 250 of you will have reached the grade of commander, and between 1991 and 1992, 148 of those will become captains. Well before the new century dawns, many of you will be wearing the stars of flag rank.

These projections consider only due course selection and promotion.

The Navy promotion system now has the capacity to move ahead as many as 15% of the truly outstanding officers of this class at an even faster pace. Such officers, if selected at the first opportunity at each point, can reach the grade of Captain in their 15th year and be considered for flag rank by their 20th year of commissioned service—in 1991, in time to lead our Navy through the final decade of the 20th century.

But, while your statistical future can be predicted with some confidence, a similar projection of the course of political and world events and their influences during your prospective career span must carry in it gross uncertainties.

The increasing complexity of international security affairs makes political prediction beyond a very few years exceedingly difficult, yet such thought and speculative study must be undertaken. You and your companions in our other services must combine the vital

ingredients of military, socio-economic, and scientific thought from which future strategy will be forged.

In the face of such uncertainty then, what principles can we recommend to keep you on the track so confidently indicated by those statistical projections of your next 29 years?

Perhaps we can find some insight by looking backward over the past 29 years at the experience of another Naval Academy class that also took up its commissions during a watershed year in our nation's history.

The Class of 1943 occupied your present positions 29 years ago this week, in June of 1942.

The speaker that day was also the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Ernest J. King. He spoke at a time when the greatest naval war in history had engulfed the world, and our own Navy was still struggling to overcome the defeat suffered on the "day which will live in infamy"—December 7, 1941. VADM Calvert, your Superintendent, and I were both members of Admiral King's audience.

His message was characteristic both of the man and the times—Admiral King was not given to fancy rhetoric—his advice was incisive and to the point. He offered us Churchill's promise of a future marked by "blood, toil, sweat and tears"—he cautioned against a "narrow-minded jealousy" of the other armed services which could serve only to delay the victory—he said that "machines are as nothing without the men who man them and give them life" and that "men are as nothing without morale."

He defined true military discipline as the "intelligent obedience of each for the effectiveness of all"—most significantly, he pointed out that "traditions, of themselves, are no more than testimonials to the successes of our predecessors" and that it was not enough for us merely to boast of tradition, but that we must "make some traditions ourselves."

His advice on that day, uttered as America embarked on a new era of involvement in a world whose economic and political fabric had been ripped to tatters, included the promise that after victory, "we Americans—under the leadership of the President—will take steps to see to it that the ability of any person or of any people to enslave others, physically or mentally or spiritually, shall be forever destroyed."

With these words, Admiral King enlisted the Class of 1943 in what has proven for many to be a lifelong crusade in pursuit of those goals.

Six-hundred-sixteen members of that class left this academy 29 years ago—142 of them remain on active duty today—20 presently hold flag or general officer rank, while 55 have given their lives in action against our nation's enemies in the three wars which have come to us during these years.

As we reflect on the words of that wartime graduation address, I believe we once again must credit Admiral King with his deserved reputation for accuracy—he was right on all oounts.

Our nation, our Navy and our class did find a demanding, war-torn world of "blood, toil, tears and sweat" beyond these academy grounds.

You also will find a world in conflict outside these walls—the essential nature of that present conflict has already touched you. It is a conflict generated by the swiftly-moving currents of social, economic, scientific, technological and political change which now characterizes not only our American society, but that of the world beyond our shores and the Navy we expect to protect those shores.

In 1942, Admiral King had no difficulty in pointing out to us who our enemies were or where they could be found. Nor did we doubt that we would find and vanquish them.

It is not so easy for you today. Many of the challenges you must immediately confront will come from within yourselves—and for each of you the challengers will wear a different face or uniform.

There will be many influences acting to push you aside from the course you have chosen. Some among you may be overcome by these forces—one faction may be defeated by technological or scientific challenges—another may be unable to cope with the demands of leading men confused and perplexed by economic or social pressures—for others, the challenge may take the form of nagging self-doubt as to the significance of a naval career in a nation which in your eyes may seem to downgrade and demean the whole idea of military service.

But, just as the powerful forces of 1942 were overcome, so also can the complex challenges of military service in the final third of this century be defeated—and by applying the same principles.

For example, Admiral King's caution against narrow-minded inter-service rivalry is one which you, too, should heed.

We are all professional men, and as professionals we should stand together and take what comes like men whatever the color of our uniforms. We share a common goal, and we should not publicly pursue contradictory roads to that goal. If we wish the image of military service to again become the honorable and respected profession we believe it to be, we must not give aid and comfort to those who would prefer to see it characterized otherwise.

Further, within the Navy 29 years after Admiral King warned us against "unionism" dividing the services, we still have the problem of "union rules" arbitrarily dividing the destroyer men from the amphibious sailors; the "tailhook" carrier fliers from the land-based aviators; and the "brownshoe" from the "blackshoe."

I have always felt that what has hurt us the most is approaching our problems from what I call a "platform orientation." When we do this, we tend to become weaker at the interface areas where the platforms supporting a common mission must tie together. The same situation applies in research and development efforts—areas such as hydrofoils or mine warfare which are not represented by a strong constitency within the general line end up much further behind than they should be.

The better approach is to define our strategic or tactical problems without regard to "platform orientation," then get on with the solution using systems or approaches optimized against the problem rather than those systems having the most influential advocates.

We have begun moving in this direction today, but it will not be until well along in your watch that we will succeed.

Whatever fantastic developments in hardware may come on line during your career span, you will also do well to recall Admiral King's injunction to your predecessors at a time when exotic new machinery and systems were just beginning to proliferate in our Navy. He said, as you recall, that "machines are as nothing without men to give them life" and that "men are as nothing without morale."

If any one idea might be thought of as controlling to both your success and that of our Navy in these coming years, this would be it.

Men and their morale must concern you at every step of your service career, during your every waking hour.

You will be dealing with a new type of American Bluejacket—an informed, articulate man whose presence in uniform will be voluntary in every respect.

Your concern for his morale must go beyond that historic concern for physical needs—adequate food, sleep and quarters—which has always marked the good leader.

He will also need to know more about the "why?" rather than the "how?" of his duties—and you will provide it or you and the Navy will lose a man.

You will need to talk to your men frankly and from a position of informed competence on matters which once were accepted as fact without discussion.

Where once, youthful opinions were generally confined in scope to matters of relatively minor social import, young people today have ranged far and wide, and hold few matters to be so sacred as to be beyond inquiry.

In the absence of a full and fair hearing and informed responses by those who lead, what alternatives are available to our young Navy people? Certainly, the most obvious one is for them to leave the Navy and seek answers elsewhere.

But, in meeting the needs of your people, the over-riding demands of discipline must also be met.

Here again, we find Admiral King's definition of discipline as "the intelligent obedience of each for the effectiveness of all" serving us as a reliable beacon.

"Intelligent obedience" is the precise opposite of "blind obedience," that characteristic of which professional military men are so readily accused these days.

There is no inconsistency between effective discipline and high morale. In fact, one cannot exist without the other—those who express concern that increasing attention to the well-being and morale of Navymen through our continuing "people-programs" may lead to a breakdown of discipline need only be reminded of Admiral King's view—that is, the essential aspect of true discipline is willingly given obedience based on informed intelligence.

There has been considerable hand-wringing on the part of a few—both within and outside of the services—about the implications of some of the Navy's personnel initiatives in the past year. Such anxiety seems to be premised on an assumption that "changes" are "relaxations" and, ergo, unquestionably will lead to a mass breakdown in discipline.

When I hear this I am reminded of a similar question raised 150 years ago when it was first proposed to change a long-accepted Navy practice.

When the suggestion was first raised in December 1820, a Congressman claimed that to abolish this practice would "altogether destroy the efficiency of the Navy"—the resolution was defeated.

Later in 1845 the issue was again brought up, and Secretary of the Navy John Mason testified that: (it) "cannot be dispensed with . . . without injury to the discipline of the service, (and) endangering the safety of our ships. . . ."—Again this tradition was retained.

What was this revered custom whose abolition could be effected only at the risk of destroying the Navy?

It was the cruel practice of lashing seamen to a grating and flogging them in front of the assembled crew!

Flogging was finally abolished in our Navy in 1850—and I note that when it was the Navy managed to survive quite well in its absence.

Unquestionably, these men were sincere in their beliefs that it was necessary to beat our Bluejacket into insensibility in order to maintain "discipline." But mere sincerity is no substitute for intelligent appraisal of problems.

I would say to you that the Navy's problem today is not one of "discipline" but one of enlightened leadership. What is needed are men with vision, imagination and, above all, understanding of what is going on in the world around them.

Navy leaders of today must have the abil-

ity to perceive and understand that, just as our world is different from that of 29 years ago, so will it differ 29 years hence.

The time is long since past when we can wrap ourselves in the comfortable memories of life in a simpler age, hoping that traditional solutions alone will work against modern problems.

Today we must be able to cope with sociological problems, which may or may not be of our making, that were inconceivable to many of us in 1942.

How many of us in 1942 dreamed that one day we would be faced with a child's argument that his use of marijuana is no different from his parents' use of alcohol?

Who among us could have predicted our need to answer the problem of ridding our services of the terrible consequences of drug addiction by thousands of our soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen?

Who, in 1942 gave a second thought to the problems, dreams and aspirations of those black and brown faces and hands that served our meals and cleaned our wardrooms?

Where was Vietnam in 1942? A part of an exotic place called Indo-China and certainly no place for a sailor.

I would suggest to those who have uneasy feelings about the state of discipline because of an extra inch of sideburns or a beer machine in the barracks that they review the record of our young naval and air force aviators who have flown as many as 300 individual missions into the heaviest anti-aircraft fire in the history of warfare. I would also remind them that 29 years ago combat aviators were being sent back to the United States after 25 missions because it was believed that this was the maximum number of missions a man could tolerate.

I would point out the 48 Medal of Honor winners from our magnificent Marine Corps and the 10 from our Navy, which includes 3 from the Brown Water Navy which I had the honor of commanding for 20 months before assuming this assignment.

Those who, in or out of the service, would take upon themselves the responsibility for determining the status of discipline of the services because of "uneasy feelings" about changes would do well to examine first what those changes are; secondly, having done so, relate them to the changing society around us, and finally, check the facts against their preconceived notions.

The time is long since past when we can retire to the coziness of the wardroom or the Officers' Club secure in the knowledge that what goes on ashore or outside the base is no concern of ours.

Today there are scores of forces at work in our country that have a direct bearing on our Navy's future and even its very existence. It is time for us to withdraw our heads from the sand and look around at the society of which we are a part, despite the trend of rejection by that society now visible.

For example, Yale, Harvard, indeed, all of the Ivy League schools have eliminated our Naval ROTC units from their culture—some of our finest flag officers of today came from that source. The real tragedy of this is that our Navy, and indeed, our Armed Services, must be representative of our whole society. Thus it is not just the Navy that is the loser, but American society itself, when any segment of that society is excluded from service.

The Navy has reached a point where we can no longer drift with the tides and winds of change totally oblivious to the demands of our youth, the needs of our civilian society, and the dignity of our personnel. The ancient, ill-defined shibboleth of "do not as I do, but do as I say" is no longer good enough.

Each of our services is beset with the problems of society because they are a part of society. Each of our service commanders recognizes these problems and each is attempting to solve them in his own way.

For example, those of you who will enter the Marine Corps today will join an elite, trim fighting organization that has, rightly so for its unique mission, chosen the way of the spartan. I salute you for your decision, just as I commend to you the leadership of your outstanding Commandant, General Chapman, for I am convinced that the path he has chosen for the Corps is the right one—just as he has stated that he believes the course we have chosen is the proper one for Navy—one which will continue to produce courageous, patriotic, young Navymen.

To those who would attempt to drive a wedge between the Navy and the Marine Corps, through differing interpretation of our policies I would point out that many have attempted to accomplish this before and each has failed.

"Traditions of themselves," as Admiral King so correctly advised us, "are no more than testimonials to the success of our predecessors"—we must always be ready to "make some traditions ourselves" and substitute them for others which no longer serve as effective channel markers to guide us for the future.

One final reference to the wisdom and foresight of that much admired voice from the past is important to consider.

He promised us that the American people would take up their fair share of the burdens in the post-war world to "see to it that the ability . . . of any people to enslave others physically or mentally or spiritually," would be forestalled.

Once more, his projection was correct.

Since that time our nation has repeatedly stood as a bulwark to prevent "one people from enslaving others." Never before in history has a nation given so much to its neighbors while asking so little in return—for the gift of freedom is priceless, although a price must be paid for it.

Americans may be proud of their accomplishments during this past quarter century—through their sacrifices, millions of people in remote lands still have the chance to remain free.

But now, as we move into the final third of this century, that post-war era has ended, and in the words of President Nixon, "new approaches are in order."

You will be privileged to serve in a Navy and Marine Corps which are daily growing more responsive to the demands of these new approaches. Your very presence will help transform their goals into reality.

As a part of those new approaches ahead as America adjusts her role in the world, we of the United States Navy will rely more and more on the support and assistance of our allied navies in defending against threats common to us all.

Accordingly, it is fitting to see among this class seven Midshipmen soon to be commissioned by our allied navies. In your experiences here together as members of the Class of 1971, you have formed personal friendships which will remain with you through the decades ahead. Your friendships can do much to foster increasing cooperation among all free world navies.

I wish to offer these seven young men my personal congratulations for their accomplishments here at Annapolis, and to wish them long and successful careers.

Finally, when the excitement and romance of June Week, graduation, and your forthcoming well-earned leave has subsided, I would ask you to recall one thought which, more than any other, must characterize your service as officers of the United States Navy and Marine Corps.

It is that you are personally accountable for your every act, official or unofficial, which may bring either credit or discredit to the uniform we share.

You owe the American people and yourself nothing less—the minimum passing grade in this subject is 4.0—if you should find this burden excessive, then your choice is clear.

Those who would command ships or men should hold indelibly in their consciousness these words from out of the past:

"Accountability is not for the intentions but for the deed. The Captain of a ship, like the Captain of a state, is given honor and privileges and trust beyond other men. But let him set the wrong course, let him touch ground, let him bring disaster to his ship or to his men, and he must answer for what he has done. No matter what, he cannot escape . . ."

It is in the absolute nature of this challenge that the true rewards and satisfactions of a naval career can be found.

The path which has brought me to this platform on this occasion now lies open before you—it is a path as individual and personal as that which has led to your own presence here today—each step along the way can be as challenging and full of potential for personal reward and satisfaction as you choose to make it.

You are ready now to embark on that journey.

To the entire Class of 1971, and to their parents and friends, I offer my sincere congratulations.

On behalf of the officers and men of the United States Navy both past and present, I welcome you aboard.

God bless you all and good luck.

In developing his thoughts yesterday, Admiral Zumwalt called forth statistics to predict approximately the kinds of choices and progress that individual graduates of the class of 1971 would make as their careers develop.

As a body, Mr. Speaker, the Congress knows the members of the class of 1971 as individual young men, as constituents or as congressional appointees to the Naval Academy 4 years ago. At some point in his career, each of those graduates who is entering the Navy or Marine Corps will cross paths with the Congress again. Some may come to us for help in resolving personal problems or decisions. Others will command volunteers from our constituencies on the high seas. One or two may address us in joint session as returning astronauts. Some will be up here testifying for the Navy in budget or other legislative hearings.

Led by David C. Leestma, the top 1971 Annapolis graduate who never received a grade less than A in his 4-year career, each member of this class is deserving of recognition as he begins to chart his course behind the beacon set by Admiral Zumwalt's remarks yesterday morning.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD, the full listing of Naval Academy graduates of the class of 1971:

U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY GRADUATION EXERCISES AND COMMISSIONING CEREMONIES, CLASS OF 1971, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 1971, 10:30 A.M.—1845–1971

CLASS OF 1971 GRADUATING WITH DISTINCTION

Diplomas will be delivered first to those midshipmen graduating with distinction in order of merit, and then to all others by companies. The names of midshipmen graduating with distinction are listed below in order of merit. All midshipmen receive the degree of Bachelor of Science, including those named following the company listings who received designated Bachelor of Science degrees as indicated:

David Cornell Leestma, James Michael Elfelt, Richard Berry Baxter, Kurt Ervin Holmquist, Lawrence Francis Clark, Joseph

Howard Johns, Michael John Kehoe, James Alan Rehkopf, Roger Stanton Saylor, James Bruce Gallemore, Thomas Leo Mendenhall, Robert Charles Wagoner, Randall Douglas Wagner, David John Odland, and Alfred Rector Hupp, Jr.

Stephen Arthur Wohler, Bradley Dale Scroggins, John Stanley Kotz, Steven Craig Spancake, Paul Walter Kolody, Glenn James Barrowman, James McLaughlin Searing, Bruce Patrick McClure, Larry Charles Johnson, Thomas James Flanagan, Russell Howard Erickson, David Elliott Radcliffe, William Renwick Nevitt, Jr., Theodore Allen Hermeling, Jr., and William Lloyd Hatcher, III.

Robert Lawrence Elsbernd, Thomas Francis Musso, Forester William Isen, Jr., Paul Duffield Swetland, Joseph Michael Schultz, Raymond Spencer Waters, Jr., David Charles Robertson, Ernest Lewis Morris, Jr., Rolland Edward Weibley, Jr., Richard Gayton Wheldon, Louis John Oswald, III, James Bryant Waddell, Martin James Speer, and Peter Francis de Vos.

Brian John Horais, David Lee Wenner, Gregory Allen Engel, Robert William Stuart, Charles Robert Bongard, John Michael Tapajcik, Daniel Lee Whitford, John James Paulson, James Christian Funke, Michael Howard Beelby, Brian Dwane Hurst, Steven Kenneth Joens, John Francis Alburger, James William Rightmire, Jr., and William Thomas Stevens.

George Edwin Schall, Jr., James Wiley Benefiel, Timothy L. Vaughan, Paul Reed Smith, Joe Christopher Midgett, James Wallace Metzger, Stephen Douglas Sitler, Richard Francis Walsh, Robert Joseph Donlan, Mark Daniel Hovermale, David Edward Polzien, Michael Edward Feeley, Raymond Joseph Hogan, Charles Maceo Collier, and Mann Aner Shoffner, III.

James William Loiselle, John Paul Jarabak, Jr., Anthony James Rehwaldt, Ronald Dean Schroder, Stephan Robert Bruce, Ralph Paine Earhart, Roger Allen Franssen, William Arthur Emslie, Bradley Scott Foster, Kenneth John Taplett, Theodore Davis Ruddock, III, Stanley Robert Szemborski, Jerome Lee Geil, and Robert Arthur Capra.

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE

First Company

John Lindsey Balcom, Robert Earl Byrd, John Philip Enderle, George William Flinn, Grant LeRoy Graeber, Timothy John Keating, Jackson Geoffrey Kimball, Fred Corwin Klein, Scott Wesley McKenzie, Michael Leggett Orrison, David Alan Pearl, Daniel John Rowe, Clay Orr Stiles, and Vincent Novela Zabala, Jr.

Second Company

Bienvenido Peneyra Alano, Jr., Jackie Moran Crowther, Richard Harold Enderly, Robert Michael Gallagher, John Lester Howard, Carl Dean Inskeep, David William Luengen, Bruce Adrian McCroskey, William Lex McKinney, Bowen Francis Rose, Jr., Leon Arthur Schierer, James McLaughlin Searing, **Lewis Allen Shatzer, Jr.**, Lawrence Frederick Simoneaux, Douglas Arthuh Smartt, and **Terry Allan Stephan.**

Third Company

David Peterson Alleman, Joseph Douglas Anthony, Drew Wentz Beasley, Terry Allen Brake, Bradley Dayton Closson, Charles Maceo Collier, Thomas Jeffrey Dodson, Theodore Arthur Fischer, II, Reid Alan Jecmen, Carl Elof Josefson, Jr., Michael John Kehoe, Fredrick Williams Keith, Michael David Marks, Frank Montgomery McAfee, Jr., David James Nichols, Michael Patrick O'Rourke, Edward James Parks, Alan Charles Ptak, George Louis Skirm, III, Leo Joseph Tredway, Jr., Joseph Steven Uberman, David Allen Whitman, and John Alan Williams.

Fourth Company

James Joseph Carlin, Jr., Kenneth Laverne Farner, Jr., Edward Michael Flanagan, John Terrence Foust, Kevin Patrick Green, Jodie Ralph Harris, Jr., William Bruce Hemphill, Harry Don Jenkins, John Alexander Jensen, Michaed Reedy King, Boleslaw Anthony Kovacinski, Alan Bruce Schaffter, Martin James Speer, Robert William Stuart, and Jack Dehaze Winkelman.

Fifth Company

Chris Bennett, Robert Clydesdale, III, Carroll Maynard Drake, Michael Richard Hagy, Charles William Hammond, Jr., Michael Roy Hecomovich, John Thomas Hughes, II, John Griffith Hume, Jr., Leo Orest Hura, Alfred Gordon Hutchins, Jr., Frank Terry Kremian, Roger Armand Morin, Robert Keith Pearce, Jr., Wayne Albert Peters, John Francis Porter, John Joseph Repicky, Jr., Perry Reece Taylor, Jr., John William Tennant, and Thomas Edwin Vickery.

Sixth Company

Thomas Durward Adams, Jr., John Francis Alburger, James Andrew Bolcar, David Charles Cradduck, Michael Edward Feeley, James Christian Funke, James Kip Gatchell, Mark Daniel Hovermale, James Donald Hower, Edward Henry Krueger, III, David Thomas Martin, William George Nielsen, John Arthur Schultz, Robert Raymond Schultz, James Warren Vivoli, James Bryant Waddell, and Edward Joseph Welsh, III.

Seventh Company

David Casey Barton, Richard Allen Burman, Gerald Leo Byrnes, Douglas George Conklin, Michael Paul Lehman, David Benjamin Miller, Michael Preston Morell, William Frederick Nold, Robert James Strobbe, Robert Elwood Walter, James Tatum Ward, and Richard Frederick Ziska.

Eighth company

John Paul Bender, Charles John Cadden, John Kevin Dolan, James Garfield Gonzales, Thomas Michael Jamison, James Raymond Maris, Richard Massa, Stanley Walter McKee, Scott Anthony Monson, George Harold Moore, Stephen Peistring, Howard Streeter Russell, David Kent Storey, Frederick Doerr Wilson, and Michael Kenneth Wilson.

Ninth company

Gary Wayne Blair, Donald Stokes Brewer, Richard Edward Colquitt, Jr., Thomas Richard Dalton, Michael Gilbert Hambleton, Willard Caldwell Hay, Jr., Charles Hall Hiles, Jr., Victor John Linnenbom, Jr., Perry James Martini, Jr., Thomas Fitzgerald O'Brien, Richard Dennis Weidman, and William Elton Yocum, Jr.

Tenth company

Charles Patrick Annis, David Robert Bloomer, Daniel David Bogdewic, Terry Lee Davis, James Wallace Garrow, Edward Richard Hebert, Jeffrey Robert Lammers, Robert Wilccx Meek, Ted Ernest Rogers, Robert Howard Settle, Mario John Summa, Brett Norris Waterman, and Jack Jerry Wong, Jr.

Eleventh company

William Bruce Brown, William Aubrey Butler, Richard Madison Crouch, Timothy George Dobrovolny, Jack William Frost, John Michael McNallen, Frederick Dan Nelson, Bruce Earl Nichols, Charles Aloysius Quinlan, III, John Francis Sattler, John William Seil, Harold Leo Sheffield, Loren Richard Shim, Robert Lynn Walton, and Cassin Young, II.

Twelfth company

David Theodore Bolduc, Charles Robert Bongard, Charles Everett Boyer, III, Donald Bruce Disney, Jr., Michael Patrick Hayden, Lambert Cornelius Heikes, John Thomas Held, David Charles Maskaluk, William Edward Otto, Phillip Kendall Parker, Richard Glen Plank, Jr., Joseph Michael Schultz, Theodore Edward Snoots, Russell Floyd Stahlak, Thomas Lee Travis, and Eugene Joseph Williams, Jr.

Thirteenth company

Eric Wayne Baittinger, David Alan Capizzi, Thomas Edward Crabtree, Jr., Robert Christopher Custer, Thomas Benton Fulton, Joseph Ferdinand Herger, Thomas Herring, III. Michael Thames James, Stephen Hugh Newnam, Richard James Rankin, Edward Jennings Sanderson, Jr., Richard Edward Schuknecht, Paul Heldmann Voss, and Terry Thomas Weiss.

Fourteenth company

Leonyx Gene Baker, Richard Sumner Burgess, Joseph Anthony Callahan, II, Dennis Alan Desmond, John Edward Kellogg, David Thomas Laws, Micajah Wilson Newman, William Edward Organek, Stephen Todd Raphael, George Leslie Rodgers, Charles William Setzler, Jr., Robert Donald St. Germain, William Robert Williams, Roger Alan Young, and Michael Thomas Zurfluh.

Fifteenth company

Sam Bingham Crimaldi, John Blair Gilmer, Jr., Roger Keith Hope, Mark Howard Lepick, John Joseph Linnehan, II, Geoffrey Lloyd McMullin, Philip Joseph Paul, III, David Pierce Polatty, III, David Edward Polzien, Samuel Jack Porter, Richard Freeman Travis, Donald Grant Williams, Jr., and Ronald Francis Wnek.

Sixteenth company

Jeffrey Horace Albright, Robert Stephen Ayers, Tommy Lyle Beckham, Michael Steven Bluestein, John Edward Calia, Alfred Francis Clarkson, Jr., David Paul Cocolin, Richard Haley Ector, William Saunders Felts, Jr., Wilson John Fritchman, Harold Lawrence Furrevig, Jeffrey Evans Lewis, Mark Searcy Macklin, Paul Gerard McIntire, John Holloway Minnich, III, Raymond Michael Murray, William Jeffrey Steelman, John Paul Timmins, and David Allan Woerner.

Seventeenth company

Robert Earl Annis, William Burke Collins, Michael Scott Donnelly, Peter Howard DuRocher, Thomas Raymond Dussman, Jr., Thomas James Flanagan, Donald Francis Gray, Jr., Christopher John Gregor, Randy Lee Hartshorn, Peter John Ibert, Phillip Joseph Keuhlen, Paul Walter Kolody, Paul Bucher Long, William Paul Matz, James Sheldon Mendelson, Daniel Scott Naedel, Michael Conithon Palmer, David Ross Rainey, Danny Lee Rickard, and Henry Milton Shaw, Jr.

Eighteenth company

Keith Paul Bersticker, William Bayne Brasel, Robert Arthur Chimenti, Mark Garland Cooksey, Michael Gordon Duncan, Patrick James Dunford, Ralph Paine Earhart, Michael Joseph Lenihan Greene, Jr., Thomas Arnn Hayman, Robert Joseph Larkin, Thomas Neal Ledvina, Hugh William Marcy, Robert Edward Nelson, Gerald Allen Padgett, Robert Dean Plyler, Thomas Francis Radich, James Alan Rehkopf, and Woody Michael Rubino.

Nineteenth company

Frederick Broughton Beacham, Jr., David Wellington Chew, MacKenzie Curtis Clark, William Henry Donges, Arthur Louis DuScheid, III, Gregory Allen Engel, Vincent John Esposito, III, Vernon Carl Graham, Peter Edward Hermann, Leslie Ray Nixon, Gary Arthur Reese. Javier Rojas, Thomas Patrick Schlax, Ronald Dean Schroder, and John Presley Shelton, Jr.

Twentieth company

Peter Nelson Ard, Glenn James Barrowman, Sanford Kendall Bernard, James Brantley Bryant, Stephen Joseph Carro, Ross Stephen Dessert, Gregory Baird Dies, Jerome Lee Geil, Leander Leon Hingle, Jr., Brian Dwane Hurst, Robert William Jacobs, Robert Cameron Loyd, Lewis Gerhard Mason, Monty Guwain Mathews, Glenn Harold Montgomery, James Thomas Clifton Moore, II, Patrick Charles Mullins, Joseph Cosimo Santillo, William Earl Soule, James Arthur Storey, III, Richard Carter Wheeler, and Carroll Gregory Wright.

Twenty-first company

Ralph Mart Alford, Jr., Gary Douglas Appenfelder, Harry William Bashore, III, Mi-

chael Ralph Compton, Steven Mark Grames, Stephen Edward Hickman, Mark Herbert Howe, Alfred Rector Hupp, Jr., Michael Edward Jastrab, Paul John Longinotti, Jr., Field McConnell, Lawrence Frederick Nolan, Joseph William Wargo, and William Thomas Wimett.

Twenty-second company

Richard Erben Alvarez, John Michael Barrett, Jr., James Webster Gokey, Gregory Paul Harper, Thomas Lewis Hoffman, John Stanley Kotz, David Edward Kunselman, John Robert Lambert, Fred Joseph Mallgrave, III, Michael Ennis McCuddin, Arlington Robert Miller, Jr., Henry Boberg Palmer, William Talbot Penniman, III, Mann Aner Shoffner, III, Mark Edward Spanbauer, Steven Craig Spancake, Daniel Dawson Stewart, Thomas Lee Sydnor, Averill Edward Tilden, and Patrick Roger Watts.

Twenty-third company

Thomas Henry Abernathy, Carl Oscar Bauer, Johal Rebel Boteler, Jack Lawrence Conrad, Patrick Michael Doyle, John Patrick Feeney, Michael John Hallahan, William Robert Large, III, Douglas Alan Murphy, David John Odland, Charles Alan Perkins, Alfred Leighton Perry, III Donald Edward Rockwell, III, John Francis Rosinski, John Harrington Schuyler, and William Thomas Stevens.

Twenty-fourth company

Patrick Francis Alexander, Marcelo Arcil, Charles Edmund Banellis, Arthur King Bennett, III, Stephen Benedict Butkus, Thomas Michael Carnahan, Robert Joseph Donlan, Eugene Norbert Dubay, Charles Joseph Dunleavy, Richard Sills Fletcher, Thomas Robert Galloway, Theodore Allen Hermeling, Jr., John August Holm, II, Richard Charles Hormel, David Allen Larson, Joe Christopher Midgett, Stephen Rhinehart Myek, Ralph Daniel Nelson, John David Nevins, Jr., Stephen Roy Newberger, John James Paulson, George Warren Perkins, Jr., John Phillip Sagi, Jeffrey Townsend Smith, Wallace Edward Winslow, Jr.

Twenty-fifth company

Robert John Beckman, Eric James Benson, Cyrus Hugh Butt, IV, Michael Frank Cohen, Patrick James Fletcher, Raymond Joseph Hogan, David Blais Howe, Dennis Michael Junge, John George Kohut, Edward Fulton Mathus, Neal Douglas Noland, Jr., James Kenneth Opsal, John Aloysious Quinn, IV, Karl Thomas Schwelm, Bradley Dale Scroggins, Michael John Swords, Richard Francis Walsh, Carl Johann Wiedemann, II, John Raymond Wilhelm, Jr. and John Alexander Withrow.

Twenty-sixth company

Fred Reinhardt Becker, Jr., Thomas Norman Dale, Stephen Franklin Dmetruk, Scott Nicholas Gessis, Timothy Troy Gilman, Jeffrey Frank Hemler, Michael Joseph Hichak, Edward Wise Kaiser, Jr., Patrick Robert Kelly, Abraham Joel Lassman, Frank William Montesano, Elwood Henry Plourde, David Charles Payer, Michael Edward Skinner, Leonard Gregory Smith, III, Michael Robert Stephens, and Edward Lawrence Sullivan.

Twenty-seventh company

Robert Joseph Agnor, John Charles Brandes, James Michael Brick, Daniel Earl Brown, Ferree Ross Burkhead, William Josph Cocos, Mark Stewart Gardner, Brenton Clair Greene, Donald Louis Gunther, Daniel Joseph Haley, Michael John Hoert, Kenneth John Hook, Bruce Richard Linder, Paul Jeffrey Loustaunau, John Francis Martin, III, Ernest Lewis Morris, Jr., Dale Alan Peterson, Timothy Earl Poole, Dana Alan Roberts, and Rex William Settlemoir.

Twenty-eighth company

Leland Dale Atkinson, Walter Hurt Barton, James Wiley Benefiel, Richard Browne Bottenberg, Ralph Gordon Burnette, Jr., Doug Woon Cho, Fred Gordon Cole, James Andrew Davis, Joseph Clay Dean, Joseph Franklin Edgerton, Robert Lawrence Elsbernd, Richard James Ferrell, Parker Channing Freeman, Scott Allen Fry, Louis Meyer Hirah, John Philip Holland, Jr., Wayne Michael Jones, Thomas Patrick O'Brien, Jr., Stephen Ransley Purdy, Michael William Senior, Stephen Douglas Sitler, Timothy Lee Vaughan, Phillip Edward Williams, and Richard Gene Zajicek.

Twenty-ninth company

John Francis Alexander, III, Ralph Emory Archsozel, Eugene Thomas Benson, Robert Donald Cabana, Philip Stephen Dunlap, John Gregory Elsberry, Alfred Eugene Ericson, Jr., Frank Charles Garcia, Jeffrey Leigh Hull, Forester William Isen, Jr., George Nicholas Kolle, Jr., Victor Tecumseh Linck, William Herman Marle, John Royal North, Gerald Wayne Pickett, Kenneth Michael Sieminski, David Michael Stahlhut, Dennis Edward Viglienzone, Gerald Chester Werner, and Stephen Arthur Wohler.

Thirtieth company

Edward Charles Beck, III, Patrick Donald Brady, John Kenneth Condon, Harold Heuszel Cummings, Jr., William Michael Ecker, Charles Peace Harris, William Ray Hilton, Benjamin A. Holland, Donald John Mikkelsen, Charles Raymond Miller, John Lowell Morris, Keith Edmund Nadolski, Herbert Mack Nave, Mitchell Lee Rowland, Douglas Edward Samelt, Russell James Shaw, and John Michael Tapajcik.

Thirty-first company

Duane Walter Brown, Charles Thomas Francis Carroll, Thomas Hill Carson, III, Joseph Earl Enright, Michael Gattrell Gaffney, David Fields Hash, James Peter Heil, Eric Marshall Hughes, Alfred James Jacobs, Richard William Loerch, John Thomas Meister, Thomas Leo Mendenhall, Donald Joseph Radomski, David Charles Robertson, Thomas Alan Secorsky, and Guy Burl Snodgrass.

Thirty-second company

John Marshall Cherry, Charles Townsend Cochran, Warren Bruce Cole, Jerald Lee Erickson, John Slater Etcher, Brian David Finegold, Thomas Henry Goski, Donald Kip Hakanson, William Michael Hall, Ronald Edward Hewett, John Paul Jarbak, Jr., John Richard Knight, Jr., Kenneth Allen Marka, Richard Theodore Morawski, Jr., John Robert Price, David Elliott Radcliffe, Michael Miller Rand, John Kevin Smith, James Murray Theis, Lynden Robert Toliver, Christopher Edward Weaver, James Alan Wish, Reginald Wallace Woolard, II, and Peter Anton Zaudtke.

Thirty-third company

Peter Arnold Baker, Gery Curtis Bakken, John Morrill Boniface, Steven Allen Brown, William Brian Carter, Jon Lawrence Cichucki, John William Closs, Vincent Paul Conroy, Jr., Daniel Lee Curry, Melvin William DeMars, Jr., Harry Michael Dereniuk, Barry Paul Griffin, David James Hackett, Paul Edward Madurski, Stephen Richard Martin, Edward McKinley Oxford, Michael Eugene Riordan, Bruce Eric Rychener, William Leroy Shutt, Paul Lewis Simpson, Michael Charles Ward, Rolland Edward Weibley, Jr., and Frederick Wray.

Thirty-fourth company

Mark Thomas Beck, Don Hobert Beckham, Thomas Edward Bjerke, Richard Mark Cheliras, Lawrence Francis Clark, Frank Merwin Gallagher, Jr., James Allen Gosma, Thomas Joel Hammons, III, James Randolph Harper, Charles Lewis Keating, Daniel Ward Lyons, Milutin Marich, Daniel Dick McConnell, Joseph Michael O'Connor, Kevin John O'Connor, Louis John Oswald, III, Peter Paul Schneider, Jr., Richard Markley Smith, James William Stratton, Michael Paul Vining, and Forrest Richard Whittaker.

Thirty-fifth company

Luis Rafael Alvarez, Sankey Lee Blanton, III, David Edward Charvat, Wayne Jay Hallenbeck, Jr., William Nelson Heflin, Jr., Stephen Craig Jennings, Franklin Wayne Jordan, Kenneth Sterling Jordan, Mark Edward Mauriello, William Renwick Nevitt, Jr., Troy Kenton Pyles, Edward Joseph Reeve, Brian David Robertson, Scott Wood Stahler, Hugh Joseph Strain, George Arthur Vassos, III, Louis Carl Vest, and William Edward Zapf, Jr.

Thirty-sixth company

James Devens Barron, Jr., Robert Craig Brubaker, Lee Edgar Burgess, Michael Fredrik Del Balzo, James Bruce Gallemore, Clive Graham, Jr., Garry Holmstrom, Mark Michael Horgan, Steven Kenneth Joens, Michael William Longworth, Robert Warren Lucy, Richard Peter Naple, Ronald Emmett Spratt, and David Craig Welling.

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN AEROSPACE ENGINEERING

Thomas Gerald Acton, Edward Arnold Ammons, Simeon Haile Austin, John Charles Ball, Daniel Surface Barrett, Richard Berry Baxter, Michael Howard Beelby, Richard Dale Blake, Barry Eugene Boswell, Errett Jay Bozarth, Michael McGee Brown, Stephen Roy Brown, Stephan Robert Bruce, John Scott Burd, Charles Frank Burlingame III, Arthur Karl Colling, Jr., James Patrick Collins, Richard James Connelly, Frank Lee Culbertson, Jr., Bradley Lee Daley, Jr., Donnie Buster Davis, Ronald Milton DeLoof, Peter Andrew Flannery, Roger Allen Franssen, Robert Wayne Fritz, and Frank Carl Fuchs.

Thomas Mark Gross, Walter Perry Havenstein, Bruce Hermanson, William Carroll Hoover, Brian John Horais, Thomas Woodward Hutson III, Jan David Janiec, Allan William Kemp, Gary Lang Koger, David Cornell Leestma, Bruce Stuart Lemkin, Paul Willard Lindgren, James William Loiselle, Michael James Lynch, Michael Reed Martin, Andrew Francis Mazzara, Michael Patrick McBride, Bruce Patrick McClure, Lawrence Lee McDonald, Craig Lee McFarlane, Peter John Mellin, Michael James Miernicki, David Eugene Miller, Raymond Thomas Miller, Jan Sherwood Milligan, and John Therrell Morris.

Gregg Patrick Mulvany, Thomas Francis Musso, Donal Alan Olsen, Jr., Valentin Poleshaj, James Edwin Queen, Kenneth Alan Richardson, Michael Gray Rohrbaugh, John Ike Sauls, Jr., Warren Robert Schultz, John Everett Scott, William McMichael Shepherd, James Joseph Sheppard, Paul Reed Smith, James Leon Smoogen, Paul Douglas Steinke, Richard Warner Taylor, Terry Lee Tonkin, Randall Douglas Wagner, David Lee Wenner, Richard Gayton Wheldon, H. Leland Whitfield III, Tom Dee Wiles, Francis Mitchell Wnek, Robert Lawrence Wolnewitz II, James Robert Yeakey, and Thomas Hop Yee.

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING

David Alan Adams, John Michael Barry, Ronald Validor Benigno, James Alan Bloom, Santiago Alonso Castillo, John Karson Eldridge, William Arthur Emslie, and Peter Joseph Giacobbe.

Donald Edward Hesse, Kurt Ervin Holmquist, Gregory John Maxfield, Robert Charles Mayes, James Wallace Metzger, Christopher Osier, Claus Peter Perkuhn, and James Franklin Postel, Jr.

Granville Dexter Pullen, James Douglas Reasoner, Jr., Anthony James Rehwaldt, Michael Bennett Stewart, William Werner Strom, Stanley Robert Szemborski, Raymond Spencer Waters, Jr., and Charles Edward Wood, Jr.

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN MARINE ENGINEERING

Karl James Athow, John Charles Bickford, Robert Arthur Capra, Stephen Allen Cheney, Richard Wayner Cooper, II, Mark William Hess, Edward Corbett Hines, III, Kenneth

Michael O'Bryant, Robert Charles Parsons, John Henry Stevenson, and Kenneth John Taplett.

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN MECHANICAL ENGINEERING

Robert Francis Adkins, Vincent Ardizzone, Michael Steven Bilecky, John Dennis Bowen, III, Richard Thomas Bowman, Jr., William Kirk Boyd, Jr., Peter Douglas Brady, Stephen Hill Brighton, Glenn Alfred Bruggemann, Dennis Raymon Bruwelheide, Timothy John Burns, Russell Morgan Carr, Robert Bentley Chapman, William Rene Chiquelin, Stephen Andrew Comer, John Alen Conkey, Peter Francis de Vos, James Alan Dokos, Gale Norman Doores, Bruce Norman Erickson, Randal Craig Finch, and Richard Gale Finley.

Bradley Scott Foster, Michael John French, Stephen Long Gemmell, Grant John Gorton, II, Gerald Francis Harris, Gregory Garver Heath, Robert Paul Hendershot, James Hergenroeder, Larry Charles Johnson, Edward William Kelly, David Anthony Knott, Thomas Alquin Laboon, Jr., Kin Kah Law, David Lawhon Lee, Gary Walter Lohman, John Harvey Long, Aljurnel Eldon Lowe, James Jefferies Lynn, III, John Christian McMacken, Donald Peter Miller, Robert Lee Morris, and Kevin Cashel Nicolin.

Michael Thomas Nordin, Keith Everett Novin, Stephen Andrew Riggs, James William Rightmire, Jr., Theodore Davis Ruddock, III, George Michael Samons, Roger Stanton Saylor, Mark Charles Scharfe, Albert Arthur Schaufelberger, III, Peter Jay Selde, Robert George Speer, Robert Harold Stuhlman, Patrick Hampton Sullivan, James Edward Toomey, Henry John Turowski, Jr., David Michael Vander Els, Terry Paul Virus, John Wendell Vivian, Wallace James Wagemaker, Allan David Wall, Daniel Lee Whitford, and Alfred James Whittle, III.

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN NAVAL ARCHITECTURE

Douglas Lieuallen Bayne, George Clough Bullard, Jr., Gregory Thomas Hedderly, Daniel George Hickey, John Hampton Hubbard, Peter Richard Jouannet, Stanton Van Mahoney, Jr., Frederick Howard Myers, Joseph Douglas Norton, Robert Redmond Stilwell, Paul Duffield Swetland, Thomas John Ternes, David Lee Vandover, Frank Thomas Walker, Jr., and Daniel Roy Welch.

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN OCEAN ENGINEERING

Edwin Harry Bouton, Jr., Duane Lee Brunelli, Michael James Collier, Steven Michael DiAntonio, Douglas Dean Gavrich, Charles Henry Griffiths, Jr., Steven Dorsey Hudson, William Trigg Long, John Lawrence Massie, Stephen Ernest Penner, Michael Robert Scherr, Arthur Francis Slater, and Ludwig Arthur Sorrentino.

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN SYSTEMS ENGINEERING

David Allen Chaney, Alan Stanley Cohlmeyer, Jeffrey Durnell Conners, James Michael Elfelt, Russell Howard Erickson, John Mark Foley, Finley Bowman Foster, Osmund Rittenhouse Fretz, III, Harry Emerson Fuqua, II, William Lloyd Hatcher, III, Scott Allen Hornung, Charles Enos Janes, Joseph Howard Johns, Neil Tillman Kinnear, III, Charles William May, John Clifton Muncie, Charles Stephen Pesce, Ronald Arthur Route, George Edwin Schall, Jr., Norman William Steffen, Scott Christoffer Steward, Robert Charles Wagoner, and Gary Ivan Washarn.

TRIBUTE TO FEDERAL JUDGE R. EWING THOMASON

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, last week the former President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, made a special trip to my home city, El Paso, Tex., to pay tribute to a distinguished former Member of the House of Representatives, a predecessor of mine, on his 92d birthday. Federal Judge R. Ewing Thomason has been a friend of Lyndon B. Johnson for more than a half century. The ex-President's father, as a member of the Texas House of Representatives, helped to elect Ewing Thomason as speaker of the Texas House in 1920. He served with great distinction as speaker, and received the unanimous endorsement of house members when he ran, unsuccessfully, for Governor of Texas.

Returning to El Paso, Judge Thomason served two terms as mayor of our city from 1927 to 1931, a period that was marked with great industrial and civic progress.

On March 4, 1931, he began a period of 16½ years as Representative of the 16th District of Texas, which I now have the honor to represent. I also have the honor of serving on a committee where Ewing Thomason gained great distinction, the Armed Services Committee, then known as the Military Affairs Committee.

He served on that committee during the crucial days that preceded World War II, and was a tower of strength in the mammoth task of preparing this Nation for the mightiest effort ever made by its Armed Forces. It will be remembered that in the summer of 1941, only a few months before the attack on Pearl Harbor, this House, by a single vote, renewed the Selective Service Act, which enabled us to raise the vast military forces we later put into the conflict. The legislative battles of that year are being renewed in 1971, and I think this is a most appropriate time to remember the efforts of men like Ewing Thomason in supporting the adequate defense of our country.

He continued his valuable service on the committee during World War II, and became its ranking Democratic member. He was the author of the Thomason Act under which hundreds of capable officers were commissioned in the armed services, and his influence was felt in every way in the crucial decisions of that period.

After the victory was won, he was called by President Truman to another position, that of Federal judge of the western district of Texas. Here he served actively for 17 years and presided over hundreds of cases, including some history making trials. He then accepted the position of senior judge, which he still holds at the age of 92. Over a period of 54 years, he has served with distinction in State, city, and Federal positions—and in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of Government.

His home city has honored him in many ways. A street and a major hospital bear his name, and he was admitted to the Hall of Honor of the El Paso County Historical Society. A birthday visit from our former President was one more mark of the affection held for Judge Thomason among all who know him. I am sure the members of this House join me in wishing many happy days ahead for my distinguished predecessor from the 16th District of Texas, the Honorable R. Ewing Thomason.

LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the dedication of the Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Library and School of Public Affairs, highlights of this memorable day were mentioned on the floor by myself, Speaker CARL ALBERT, Majority Whip HALE BOGGS, and Minority Leader GERALD FORD.

Today I would like to present a summary montage of the dedication as seen through the eyes of some of the Nation's press.

I understand that the other body today plans a similar discussion, keying on the actual transcript of the dedication program. Former Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY and Senator BARRY GOLDWATER are slated to head the discussion.

I therefore have asked permission to revise and extend my remarks at this point, including extraneous matter, and to offer my summary for inclusion in the RECORD. I shall also ask for 5 legislative days so that the other Members might contribute to this historic event.

[From the Sunday Star, May 23, 1971]

LBJ LIBRARY DEDICATED—"STORY OF OUR TIMES"

Among a display of "letters to the president" are letters to Johnson from Nixon and from the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Eisenhower, then living in retirement at Gettysburg, wrote Johnson, then vice president, on May 5, 1962, a letter that sums up what presidential libraries are all about.

After expressing appreciation for Johnson's appearance at dedication of the Eisenhower library in Abilene, Kans., Eisenhower wrote:

"I hope you will agree with me that in the series of presidential libraries that have so far been erected, those who have played a part in building them have made a lasting contribution to the understanding by the people of the United States of the working of government, its complexities and responsibilities."

[From the Houston Chronicle, Texas Magazine, May 16, 1971]

CONGRESS INTERVENES

It had been the tradition until 1955 that all papers accumulated by a president during his term of office were his to do with as he wished.

This resulted in many of the collections being lost or destroyed.

"Some were lost in fires," said Harry Middleton, director of the LBJ Library. "Some were stashed away in attics and never seen again. Some were scattered in public and private collections."

Out of the first 35 presidents' papers, substantial collections exist for only 26. They include Washington, John Adams, Jefferson, Madison, John Quincy Adams, Jackson, Van Buren, Polk, Buchanan, Lincoln, Johnson, Hayes, Garfield, Cleveland, Benjamin Harrison, McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson, Coolidge, Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson.

The presidents whose papers have been destroyed or largely dispersed are Monroe,

William Henry Harrison, Tyler, Taylor, Fillmore, Pierce, Grant, Arthur and Harding.

During his administration, President Truman expressed concern that there was no systematic way for a president to make his papers available to scholars.

"He was also concerned that the heirs of presidents were taken advantage of by dealers trying to get their papers," Middleton explained.

In 1955, after Truman had left the White House, Congress passed the Presidential Libraries Act. It authorized the General Services Administration to accept and operate any presidential library that might be offered as a gift to the U.S. Government and to preserve the presidential papers and other historical materials within.

[From the Houston Post, May 21, 1971]

THE JOHNSON LIBRARY

Twentieth-century Americans stand in the Library of Congress and read the draft of the Declaration of Independence with words crossed out and changed by Thomas Jefferson. At the Alamo they read a letter from a boy who had just drawn the black bean of death in the ill-fated Mier Expedition. In such moments, 1776 or 1842 comes alive again.

It is harder now to realize that letters, papers, pictures, documents of 1930 to 1970 are the 20th century's claim to immortality, to the thoughts and imagination of future generations. With the opening of the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library Saturday, the largest collection ever accumulated and left by any President enters the open storehouse of history.

A thank-you note is oddly impressive when it is from Ho Chi Minh expressing appreciation of Apollo 8 photographs from the moon. A tender note from a woman to her husband is significant when it encourages him to run for the presidency of his country. A get-well card with a dollar attached from a woman saying, "You may not remember what you've done for us, but we remember you," says something to historians.

Like the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials in Washington, the LBJ Library is architecturally designed to show what a President worked to achieve through government. Visitors will read there: "When our fundamental American rights were given to us by the founding fathers, they reflected the concerns of a people who sought freedom in their time. But in our time a broadened concept of freedom required that every American have the right to a healthy body, a full education, a decent home and the opportunity to develop to the best of his talents."

[From the Dallas Times Herald, May 23, 1971]

THE LBJ LIBRARY

The dedication Saturday of the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library on the University of Texas campus at Austin was a significant event not only for Lyndon Johnson himself, but for the people of Texas and, in fact, for the people of the nation.

For in this imposing and beautiful structure, built at a cost of $18 million, has been assembled the most complete historical record of the times and accomplishments of any president of this nation.

There are other presidential libraries but none that comes close to matching this magnificent edifice or the documented story it tells of one of the most significant time spans in the history of the nation and the world.

And important above all is the fact that this intense lesson in history is available to all who elect to peruse it by visiting the library.

There they will find presented in graphic detail the acknowledged far-reaching and monumental domestic accomplishments of Lyndon Johnson as president—the advancement in civil rights, in housing, in space, in conservation; in, briefly, the welfare of the nation's citizens. They will also find there the Lyndon Johnson record in foreign affairs. To be sure, this record is now controversial, but let us not forget that history has not yet rendered its verdict on the record. When it does, we believe it will find that Lyndon Johnson's actions were far more often right than wrong in the best interest of this nation.

Be that as it may, all the records are here, and as The Times Herald's Frank Langston has written in the LBJ Library supplement in this paper Friday.

"When had mankind ever before had access to such records? When had such records ever been assembled during the lifetime of many of the men who had helped to shape history during one of the most critical periods the world has ever known?"

And we will simply add, when indeed?

[From the Kansas City Times, May 21, 1971]

THE NEW PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY

Residents of this metropolitan area can appreciate the significance of the Lyndon B. Johnson library which will be dedicated tomorrow on the campus of the University of Texas. It has now been almost 14 years since the Harry S. Truman library was opened in Independence, and that vast storehouse of knowledge has become a mecca for historians, travelers and the one-hour Sunday students of history.

Already more than 2 million visitors have passed through the heavy glass doors to inspect some of the priceless documents of the Truman years as well as other official papers that trace the highpoints of the America presidency. Every President from George Washington to Richard M. Nixon is represented.

The Johnson library has an added advantage because of its affiliation with the University of Texas. An adjoining building will house the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, which means that the library will become a working part of a major educational institution. Sentimental reasons figured in establishing the Truman library in Independence, the Eisenhower library in Abilene and the Hoover library in West Branch, Ia. Each of those communities had played a major role in the early life of a President. However, the absence of a university setting has reduced the potential use and contribution of those three institutions and that is regrettable.

Saturday should be a memorable day in Austin, Tex., with President Nixon and Vice-President Agnew leading the official delegation. It was a similar day of eminence in Independence on July 6, 1957, when Eleanor Roosevelt, Herbert Hoover, Earl Warren and Lyndon Johnson, then majority leader of the Senate, joined one of the most distinguished audiences ever assembled in the Middle West to help Harry and Bess Truman dedicate their library.

Although it has been pointed out that the growing number of presidential libraries is dispersing the official White House record outside Washington, there is one major advantage in this trend. For those people who are unable to visit the national shrines in distant parts of the United States, the libraries are offering a more convenient capsule of American history. The Truman library has served that function the last 14 years. In the future the Johnson library should do the same for the Southwest.

[From the Texas Times, April-May, 1971]

UNLIMITED, CONTINUOUS RESOURCES

STATESMANSHIP

"No other account of statesmanship has been recorded in greater depth or breadth," said Dr. Harry Ransom, chancellor emeritus of The University of Texas System.

"From natural resources to educational planning, from programs in health and civil rights to complex foreign affairs, the Library's original materials reflect not only topical subjects but also permanent concerns of humanity.

"The most important single quality of the Library is that its spirit is informed by President Johnson's spirit. His time is reflected here not as the era of a Texan or of one citizen who held the highest office in the United States. It is revealed as a period in which men and women came to realize more poignantly their roles as human beings."

[From the Texas Times, April–May 1971]

PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARIES ACT PASSED IN 1955—AUTHORIZES FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO ACCEPT, OPERATE ALL SUCH FACILITIES

Presidential libraries now in existence and operated by the Federal Government include the Herbert Hoover Presidential Library in West Branch, Iowa; the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library in Hyde Park, N.Y.; the Harry S. Truman Library in Independence, Mo.; the Dwight D. Eisenhower Library in Abilene, Kan.; the John F. Kennedy Library (authorized but not constructed) in Cambridge, Mass., and the Lyndon B. Johnson Library in Austin, Texas.

A NECESSITY

A Presidential library is considered almost a necessity now due to the great growth in volume of Presidential papers. Franklin D. Roosevelt's papers totalled 20 million, while Lyndon Johnson's totals 31 million.

Besides the Presidential papers, a Presidential library houses the gifts, memorabilia and rare historical objects acquired by a President.

"In my opinion there should be a melding of both library and museum, a melding from which they would both profit and both become more alive, more vividly used as an instrument to record and remember history," Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson has said.

President Johnson's collection began in 1937 when he announced his intention to run for Congress. It has grown steadily through the intervening years.

ASKED IN 1965

In 1965, The University of Texas asked him to place his papers on the Austin campus in a building the University would provide. In addition, the University offered to create a School of Public Affairs and name it for the 36th President.

President Johnson felt it would be important and wise to place his Library on a campus of learning, where use of the papers would be part of the intellectual atmosphere. In addition to use of the papers by researchers, the Library's museum will be open to all citizens.

The Lyndon B. Johnson Library is the first Presidential library to be located on a university campus. For years to come, scholars from across the United States will come to The University of Texas at Austin to study the papers, and visitors to see the museum.

MUST BE, AND WHY

Franklin D. Roosevelt summarized what Presidential libraries must be and why they must be:

"To bring together the records of the past and to house them in buildings where they will be preserved for the use of men and women in the future, a nation must believe in three things: It must believe in the past. It must believe in the future. It must, above all, believe in the capacity of its own people so to learn from the past that they can gain in judgment in creating their own future."

Mr. Speaker, Sunday, May 23, 1971, will also be remembered as the official dedication of the new Lyndon Baines Johnson School of Public Affairs. This

innovative educational institution will serve as a unique training ground for public leaders. At this juncture, Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert newspaper analysis of the L. B. J. school:

[From the Texas Times, April-May 1971]

THE JOHNSON LIBRARY AND SCHOOL

EAST CAMPUS AREA

The site chosen for the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library is situated on the east side of the University campus and is on a direct axis with the Main Building. The LBJ Library is part of a new group of buildings called the East Campus. One of those buildings, Sid W. Richardson Hall, designed by the same architects and built at the same time as the LBJ Library, blends architecturally with the Library. One of the three units of Richardson Hall, dedicated last January, houses the Lyndon Baines Johnson School of Public Affairs.

In designing the Johnson Library, the architects felt that the building should express through monumentality the importance of the historical rarities to be protected and preserved—that the building should evidence from without and within that it is truly a treasury of important documents.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Texas Magazine, May 16, 1971]

LIBRARY FOR LYNDON

(By Martin Dreyer)

A man who was involved in the project said: "You'll find the LBJ Library exciting."

A library exciting? In a lifetime of visiting libraries we'd never thought of any of them as exciting. They were somber, cavernous places, with wall-to-wall tomes, scholarly places where you stepped softly and spoke in hushed whispers.

But the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library? Maybe exciting is the word for it.

It's where visitors will see, hear and sense many of the problems and achievements of the presidency told in exhibits, films, colorful gifts from heads of state and the public, re-creations of the White House and a vast collection of papers and documents.

The building, an eight-level structure of travertine marble rising handsomely from a promontory-like plaza, will be the national repository of the public papers, documents, audio and visual records encompassing the entire range of Johnson's public career. In the 34-year span he was National Youth Administration administrator for Texas, U.S. congressman, U.S. senator, majority leader of the Senate, vice-president and president.

His long career has produced the most extensive collection of research material on a single president. Scholarly interest centers on the estimated 31 million pages of manuscript materials. Most of them are his own papers but they include personal papers of his associates and contemporaries.

These papers must be processed and screened, a tedious job, and it will probably be three years before a significant volume of them can be opened to research scholars, said Harry Middleton, the library's director.

Besides the archives, the library houses a museum with exhibits drawn from a collection of more than 30,000 items. The exhibits bring to life, through multi-media, the sights and sounds, the events and programs of the Johnson years.

Tour of the library begins with the biographical display of Lyndon Johnson. Shown through a panel of pictures, the exhibit traces him from boyhood to the present.

Among objects and documents is the small card on which the then new President wrote out his first statement to the American people while returning to Washington after the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

The visitor gets a look at "The Great Society" programs through another display of motion picture films and photos. He reviews the intentions and accomplishments in areas of poverty, civil rights, health, education, consumer affairs, space exploration and ecology in the '60s.

Other panels show techniques used in the effort to eradicate poverty and ecological threats and to bring justice to the black, brown and red man.

Life in the White House—want to get a feeling of how it was? There are re-creations of the East Room and the private family living room plus personal objects used by the Johnsons. Also, the wedding gowns and bridesmaids dresses worn when daughters Lynda and Luci were married.

Near this display are letters and gifts sent to President and Mrs. Johnson from kings, queens, emperors, prime ministers and other heads of state.

A travertine stairway rises to "The Great Hall." There the visitor sees through glass five floors housing the papers collected during the Johnson career. The documents are stored in red buckram boxes adorned with the gold presidential seal.

At the top of the stairs a large five-panel photographic mural etched in magnesium shows Johnson as a congressman (with President Franklin D. Roosevelt), as a senator (with President Truman), as Senate majority leader (with President Eisenhower), as vice-president (with President Kennedy) and as president.

Exhibit cases in the Great Hall hold memos, notes, letters and documents that give visitors glimpses of the dramatic and mundane duties of the president. There's everything from the six-day crisis in the Middle East to the crowning of an apple blossom queen.

Chiseled on the north wall is the seal of the president.

Also, on this level, is a temporary exhibition gallery, where exhibitions will be changed periodically, and two large glass rooms housing 10 TV consoles that present the Johnson Administration programs in conservation, space, housing, civil rights, health, education and international affairs.

Political cartoons, selected from a collection of about 3000, bring laughs as well as grim memories of issues that jolted a nation. The Ralph Becker collection of items from past political campaigns—George Washington to Richard Nixon—illustrate the fanfare of American political life. These include songs, buttons, hats, placards, literature and other paraphernalia.

In the "Political Campaigns Through The Years" exhibit, tape recordings re-enact the campaigns of Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy. The "Era of LBJ" display recalls the 1964 convention in Atlantic City, the 1965 inauguration and issues from the '30s to the '60s.

On the top floor is a scale reproduction of Johnson's Oval Office in the White House. It's seven-eighths the original size and has all the original furnishings. Johnson plans to use it as his office when he's in the building. In any event, his voice will always be there. Visitors can activate it by pushing a button.

On this eighth level, reading rooms, microfilm rooms and carrels will be available to scholars, writers and researchers. There they will dig into the 31 million presidential papers and documents, sifting through the facts, policies, figures and decisions of four decades of the 20th century.

[From the Texas Times, April-May, 1971]

THE JOHNSON LIBRARY AND SCHOOL

A tour through the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library on the campus of The University of Texas at Austin will be as close to a conversation with the former President of the United States as the planners can make it.

From the time the observer of American history enters the great museum, he will see, hear and sense tumultuous problems and achievements of the Sixties and the Presidency told in exhibits, films, re-creations of portions of the White House, gifts from heads of state, bridal gowns worn by daughters of a President, papers and documents and personal gifts to the President.

Featured are objects and documents, including the small card on which the then new President of the United States wrote out his first statement to the American people in 1963 while returning to Washington after the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

Through another panel display of motion picture films and photographs, the visitor will experience "The Great Society" programs. The intentions and accomplishments in areas of poverty, civil rights, health, education, consumer affairs, space exploration and ecology in the Sixties will be explained.

Other panels depict accomplishments in the struggle to eradicate poverty and ecological threats, to bring justice to the black, brown and red man, and to show techniques used to assault those problems.

IN WHITE HOUSE

In the "Life in the White House" re-creation, located adjacent to the staircase leading to the second floor, the visitor can see the wedding gowns, and bridesmaids' dresses of Lynda and Luci's weddings. Re-creations of the East Room and the private family living room plus personal objects used by the Johnson's will depict their life in the historic structure.

Near the display are the letters and gifts sent to President and Mrs. Johnson from kings, queens, emperors, prime ministers and other heads of state. Foreign affairs during the Johnson Administration will be depicted in oblong photographs in an interlocking three-dimensional panel design.

Leaving the displays on the ground floor, the visitor will ascend a travertine stairway to "The Great Hall." For the first time in a Presidential library, the collection of Presidential papers has been arranged as an integral feature of the architecture. The visitor will see through glass walls five floors of library stacks housing the papers collected during the public career of Lyndon Johnson. The documents are stored in red buckram boxes adorned with the gold Presidential seal.

The exhibit cases in the Great Hall hold the memos, notes, letters of the episodes in the administration of Lyndon Johnson, and documents, giving the visitor glimpses of the varied, dramatic and mundane duties of the President from the six-day crisis in the Middle East in 1967 to the greeting of a Mardi Gras queen.

In the "Political Campaigns Through The Years" exhibit, short tape recordings will bring to life again the campaigns of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower and John F. Kennedy. The 1964 convention in Atlantic City, the 1965 inauguration and the issues of the Thirties, Forties, Fifties and Sixties will be recalled in the "Era of LBJ" display.

As the visitor exits the building, the last exhibit, "The President and the People," will show gifts to the President, ranging from quilts, carvings, humorous and touching letters, to a crocheted American flag.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Texas Magazine, May 16, 1971]

SPEAKING OF LYNDON

The famous and the obscure, the close advisers and the outspoken opponents of Lyndon Johnson were interviewed on tape for the library collection.

It adds up to one of the most complete oral history collections of friends and foes alike of a president of the United States.

The Oral History is directed by Dr. Joe B. Frantz, UT history professor. He worked more than a year from an office in Washing-

ton with a staff of interviewers and assistants.

A total of 933 tapes record the interviews of 555 persons. The average interview lasted 60 to 90 minutes and produced 30 to 50 pages of transcription.

Dr. Frantz explained that abundant documentary evidence already existed on President Johnson's career and the programs with which he was associated, "but it helped fill out the record to talk to persons who were involved in some of those programs to see why certain decisions were made and the alternatives that were considered."

Those interviewed ranged from former White House assistant Jack Valenti to Georgia Gov. Lester Maddox, from the late Sen. Everett Dirksen to the young intern who was on duty at a Washington area hospital in 1955 when Johnson was admitted with a heart attack.

Dr. Frantz said only a half dozen persons refused to be interviewed.

"The great majority of the interviewees were candid, and although some of Lyndon Johnson's opponents may have been a little guarded in their statements, others laid it on the line to the fullest."

[From the Texas Times, April–May 1971]

ORAL HISTORY—OF FRIENDS AND FOES ALIKE

One of the most complete oral history collections of friends and foes alike of a President of the United States will be included in the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library when it is dedicated May 22 on the campus of The University of Texas at Austin.

When a 34-year public career is climaxed with the Presidency, each fragment in the design takes on a national historical significance.

That long period witnessed the Depression, World War II, the Korean War, major social legislation, the civil rights movement, the emergence of nuclear capabilities and space exploration, advances in technology, urbanization and hundreds of significant changes in the nation's life.

WORKED FROM WASHINGTON OFFICE

Directing the Oral History Project is Dr. Joe B. Frantz, UT Austin history professor who worked for more than a year from an office in Washington with a staff of interviewers and assistants.

A total of 933 tapes record the interviews of 555 persons, filling in information that cannot be obtained from written documents. An average interview lasted 60 to 90 minutes and produced 30 to 50 pages of transcription.

Dr. Frantz started with an original list of 1,600 interview possibilities in 1968, but "names were added and dropped along the way."

He explained that abundant documentary evidence already exists on President Johnson's career and the programs with which the President had some association, "but it helps fill out the record to talk to persons who were involved in some of those programs to see why certain decisions were made and the alternatives that were considered."

The UT Austin professor said some of the interviews are "heavily analytical" while others are "simply narrative" and are intended to reveal "the times of Lyndon Johnson as much as the life." He indicated the interviews were generally planned to be "more issue-oriented than personality-oriented."

Among those interviewed by Dr. Franz and his staff were the famous and the obscure, the close advisers and the outspoken opponents.

The list ranges from former White House assistant Jack Valenti to Georgia Governor Lester Maddox, from the late Senator Everett Dirksen to the young intern who was on duty at a Washington-area hospital in 1955 when Lyndon Johnson was admitted after suffering a heart attack.

'OBVIOUS' PERSONS TO INTERVIEW

Dr. Frantz points out that among the "obvious" persons one would expect to be interviewed for such an oral history are members of the President's cabinet and long-time political associates on the Texas and national scene.

Dr. Frantz said only a half-dozen persons refused to be interviewed.

Dr. Frantz hopes eventually to interview President Richard Nixon for the project, "but that interview probably won't take place until after he leaves office."

AMPLE PRECEDENCE FOR COLLECTION

Dr. Frantz said there is ample precedence for collecting oral histories of former U.S. presidents, but that the Texas project "is the most ambitious to date."

He said Columbia University, as part of its extensive oral history effort that covers many subjects, has done some tape recordings about Presidents Herbert Hoover and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Oral histories are currently under way under auspices of the National Archives on Presidents Harry S Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower and John F. Kennedy.

[From Christian Science Monitor, May 25, 1971]

WHITE HOUSE—IN TEXAS?

(By Courtney R. Sheldon)

Others in the select audience, like Roy Wilkins, an illustrious leader of the blacks, said Mr. Johnson was the one President of these times with whom he could truly communicate.

OVAL OFFICE REPLICA

Now that the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library is ruled by government archivists, it will attract more detached visitors—millions of children and the handfuls of scholars that happily frequent such repositories.

Who knows what the scholars may find that contemporary society hasn't heard of? But this magnificent library building will be a thing of beauty for many and an absolutely captivating exhibit of Johnsonian-Texan Americana for the young of the West. For this alone, the LBJ library will be a noble contribution to American life.

Can youngsters touring Washington see the White House oval room where the big wheels of politics spin and every day is for history?

No—but now they can go to Texas to learn about the presidency. In far-off Austin they can look in on a fascinating seven-eighths replica of the oval office as it was in Mr. Johnson's term of office. Mr. Johnson may still use it occasionally.

Mr. Johnson's recorded voice will give tourists a briefing as they drink in the details of a room that already looks period dated. Dominating the wall is a black-caped Franklin D. Roosevelt, a Johnson hero, whom even the mothers and fathers of today's young children know only through history.

VIEWS ON EXHIBITS VARY

The voice of Mrs. Johnson, who played a large role in planning the library, describes life in the White House while the library visitor stands astounded at the three-dimensional blowups of White House rooms.

One cannot help wishing that modern science had developed electronic recording techniques in time for Washington and Lincoln.

The Johnson library format will surely be a model for presidential libraries to come and they will not easily top it.

On the whole, the public exhibits, which will change from time to time, can be counted on to represent objectively the Johnson era, according to library officials.

It is modern, monolithic in design, and unrelieved by ornaments or windows, designed by its architects to be strong and challenging.

Not to be overlooked is that the university also established in conjunction with the library a Lyndon Baines Johnson School of Public Affairs to train students for public service.

As Mrs. Johnson explains it in the forthcoming issue of the Reader's Digest, her husband knew that "the majority of the schools that trained people for public service were concentrated in only a few areas" and he wanted a Texas school to give them a chance to get into the mainstream of American thought and action.

Mr. and Mrs. Johnson have contributed $2,000,000 toward both the school and the library, both built with nonpublic funds. The Johnsons have put their money where their heart is.

[From New York Times, May 23, 1971]

A SUCCESS AS ARCHITECTURE AND AS MONUMENT—A TEXAS-BIG LIBRARY HOUSES IMPRESSIVE EXHIBIT OF ERA

(By Ada Louise Huxtable)

In the random way that democracy scatters art and monuments among its leaders, Mr. Johnson has a winner.

It has produced a substantial work of architecture. The age of Lincoln and Jefferson memorials is over. It will be Presidential libraries from now on.

Inside, under a coffered ceiling formed by the exposed girders is a Great Hall, 85 feet square and 55 feet high.

This superb space focuses on a full-height glass wall at one end, behind which four of the five floors of archives are clearly visible, as rows of red buckram-covered boxes with gold Presidential seals. The effect is of a glowing, brilliant abstraction. Documents are turned into high esthetic drama.

The building is as handsome as $18-million, superbly matched Italian cream travertine, a large design talent and breathtakingly fine construction and detailing can make it. Sophisticated techniques use film, photography and TV. This is the art, as well as the history of our time.

What seems, in published descriptions of the building to be overblown and vulgar, is not.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Texas Magazine, May 16, 1971]

LIBRARY FACTS

Location: On high eastern portion of University of Texas campus in Austin, situated on a 30-acre site. The library sits on a promontory-like plaza adjoining the Sid Richardson Hall and LBJ School of Public Affairs.

Dedication: 11:30 a.m. Saturday, May 22, 1971, on library grounds.

Hours: 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. daily, starting May 23. No admission charge.

Architecture: Modern, monolithic in design, unrelieved by ornaments or windows. Travertine marble, exterior and interior.

FLOOR PLAN

First floor: Main entrance to library exhibition hall, measuring 200 feet by 90 feet. Open to visitors. A broad staircase leads to another exhibition hall on the second floor.

Second floor: This exhibition hall also open to visitors. On half of this level the ceiling rises to the seventh floor, permitting visitors to glimpse through glass panels the library stacks on each of the floors above.

Third-seventh floors: Library and archives stacks.

Eighth floor: Offices for library administrators and working librarians, reading rooms, research areas, microfilm reading room. Also, the replica of the Oval Office in the White House which will serve as an exhibit and as an office for former President Johnson when he is in the building. An open courtyard is centrally located on this floor.

Basement: LBJ Library space for service facilities, including storage, mechanical, maintenance and work areas, plus audio-vis-

ual equipment. Also, a 1000-seat auditorium, 250-seat lecture hall, reception-lobby area and exhibition gallery.

LIBRARY EXHIBITS

First floor

Biography of Lyndon Johnson
The Great Society Programs
Life in the White House
Letters to the President
Gifts From Heads of State
The President and the People
International Affairs

Second floor

The Great Hall
Magnesium Wall Mural of Career of LBJ
Archives
The Presidential Seal
Johnson Administration Programs
Becker Collection of Political Campaign Memorabilia
Political Campaigns Through the Years
Days in the Life of a President

Eighth floor

Replica of Oval Office in White House

[From the Texas Times, April–May, 1971]

LBJ SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

"BROADEN VISION"

Dean Gronouski explains that the Johnson Library "will draw to the campus for varying periods persons who might not come just to a teaching institution."

"While scholars engage in research in the Presidential Library," the dean continued, "some part-time faculty appointment may be arranged for them in the School of Public Affairs." He said that by drawing visiting scholars into the school's orbit "we can broaden the vision of our students."

While Dean Gronouski looks forward to the "spillover" of visiting scholars into the LBJ School, he says the LBJ Library also will offer important resources for the development of case studies that can be used in the seminars of the School of Public Affairs.

WILL "MINE" LIBRARY

"Because our students regularly work on public affairs problems, they will 'mine' the LBJ Library for the historic background on development of government programs," he explained.

Other ties expected to be fostered between the Johnson Library and the Johnson School of Public Affairs include the cosponsorship of several future lectures and conferences, Dean Gronouski said.

According to Dean Gronouski, the "research potential of the LBJ Library coupled with the possibility of having some association with students and faculty of the Johnson School undoubtedly will attract a community of scholars—not only from academe but from public life, the news world and other areas."

[From the Houston Chronicle, Texas Magazine, May 17, 1971]

FOR DOERS ONLY—THE LBJ SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Dean John A. Gronouski stretches back, feet on desk, and in a relaxed but jet-energy voice tells about the school he heads and its plans to turn out doers who will help solve the problems of society.

"It's the only one of its type," he says. "Our concept is to train for roles of leadership in public policy—to develop the ability to grapple with a wide range of problems. We feel such training can best be accomplished by having students tackle real problems from the real world and try to come up with solutions."

The Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, occupying a third of the 935-foot-long Sid W. Richardson Hall, is on the University of Texas campus adjacent to the LBJ Library. The school is to be dedicated at the same time as the library.

There are 16 hand-picked students in this graduate professional school which opened for business last September. The two-year course leads to a Master of Public Affairs degree.

It takes special talents to crash the LBJ SPA, which one waggish instructor called: "A healthy place to work and study." The 16 students were chosen from more than 250 applicants, on the basis of scholastic record, work experience, motivation and the way they handle themselves.

Four are girls, mini-styled and maxi-brained.

Dr. Gronouski says he expects to have 60 students next year and that by the fifth year enrollment will reach its maximum of 200 students, with about 30 to 35 staff members. He hopes the school will be authorized to offer work in a four-year doctoral program.

The stocky, quick-moving dean is a natural to head a school not interested in turning out specialists, but concerned that its students "develop multiple skills that can be used to attack problems in a variety of areas of the public sector." He, himself, is a doer, a problem solver, a man of multiple skills.

Among his accomplishments: Ambassador to Poland, 1965–68; Postmaster General of the United States, 1963-65; Wisconsin Commissioner of Taxation, 1960-63. He got his PhD. in economics from the University of Wisconsin, was professor of economics at the University of Maine and Wayne State University. He survived 24 combat missions as a first lieutenant in the Army Air Corps.

Now 52, he demonstrated a new skill, that of heading a unique school whose first year is "experimental" but whose concept "is set in granite."

"Historically, universities have been developed as elitist institutions," he says. "We should have ivory towers and I certainly don't disparage philosophers and thinkers. But universities must turn out more problem solvers than in the past, the orientation must be toward participation in our society."

He points out that the basic objectives of the LBJ School are to train students how to delineate and get at problems, to provide them with a "tool box" of skills that can be applied to analyzing and solving problems, and to give them a thorough grounding on the broad conceptual framework within which the processes of government are carried out.

The curriculum has been designed "like a three-legged stool—with a number of crossbars." The "legs" include problem research seminars, a study of quantitative tools and a reading-discussion program.

The school started off with two research seminars but when enrollment is at full mast it hopes to have as many as 20 seminars in action concurrently. The present two are a Water Resources Seminar, specifically zeroed in on the question of San Antonio's water problem, and a Latin American Seminar, specifically looking at the Agency for International Development program in Guatemala.

Dean Gronouski, who is ably backed up by Associate Dean Alexander Clark, sits in on some of the sessions.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Texas Magazine, May 17, 1971]

THE LIBRARY IS AN ASSET

Plans are for each research seminar to focus on a specific problem. In trying to come up with a solution, each research group "will become aware of the things than can make or break a policy."

The second "leg" of the curriculum—a study of quantitative tools—is geared to give streamlined instruction in such subjects as computer science, mathematics, statistics, econometrics, linear programming, environmental mapping and monitoring. The students gain a working knowledge of these tools, which are of big value to today's administrators.

Gronouski takes the visitor to one of the rooms where teletypes are connected with a computer system on the campus. Ida Powell, 26-year-old Houstonian, is operating one of the machines. She is one of the brighter students, a restless young woman with flashing eyes.

In learning to utilize the computer as a tool of problem solving, she says she plans to tackle the problem of congressional redistricting.

"I'm interested in community development," she says. "In Houston I worked on the original community task force that developed the model-city proposal."

She taps questions on the machine and gets rattling answers in computer code. The dean grins.

"I don't understand it either," he tells the visitor.

The third "leg" is a reading-discussion program, dealing with such subjects as policy process in American government, and freedom, power and responsibility. Speed-reading courses are included and the videotaping of oral presentations.

Although it's a graduate school, Gronouski expects later "to experiment with undergraduates, to get them in the programs."

The school, which has its own spacious library, figures to profit from the adjacent LBJ Library.

"It will help us attract staff members that we wouldn't ordinarily get," says the dean. "You know, scholars working on various research projects who will be willing to teach at our school part-time. Also, public affairs people who are doing research. We'll bring them over to meet and talk to the students."

He gazes out a window at the looming structure of travertine marble.

"There's a great wealth of research material," he says. "And we really plan to mine it."

[From the Texas Times, April-May, 1971]

DEAN

Dr. John A. Gronouski, former Postmaster General of the U.S. and Ambassador to Poland, became dean of the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at The University of Texas at Austin on Sept. 15, 1969.

He also holds appointment as a professor of economics.

The LBJ School of Public Affairs, which opened in 1970, offers graduate-level training for students planning careers in public policy-making.

Dr. Gronouski, born Oct. 26, 1919, in Dunbar, Wis., earned his B.A. degree at the University of Wisconsin in 1942, having first attended Wisconsin State College.

He entered the Army Air Corps in April 1943 as a private. He became a navigator, flying 24 combat missions over Europe. He was discharged as a first lieutenant.

Dr. Gronouski returned to the University of Wisconsin, earning an M.A. in 1947. Prior to receiving a Ph.D. from Wisconsin in 1955, he taught at the University of Maine (1948–50) and served as a research associate for the Federation of Tax Administrators (1952–56).

The author of numerous articles and studies, Dr. Gronouski joined the faculty of Wayne State University in Detroit in 1957, teaching public finance, state and local finance, and money and banking.

In 1959 he won a Civil Service appointment as research director of Wisconsin's Department of Taxation. In October 1959 he became executive director of the Revenue Survey Commission and in January 1960 was named State Commissioner of Taxation, a position he held until 1963.

The late President John F. Kennedy nominated Dr. Gronouski as Postmaster General on Sept. 9, 1963.

He was reappointed by President Johnson as Postmaster General and was sworn in during February 1965.

In August 1965, President Johnson announced that he was naming Dr. Gronouski Ambassador to Poland. Dr. Gronouski relinquished the ambassadorship in 1968.

In his role as Ambassador, Dr. Gronouski was the United States' representative in the "Warsaw talks" held periodically with the Chinese ambassador in Warsaw. He also was deeply involved in efforts of the U.S. government through the Polish government to induce North Vietnam to engage in peace negotiations.

Dr. Gronouski holds honorary doctorates from Alliance College and Fairleigh Dickinson University and is the recipient of a distinguished alumnus award from Wisconsin State College. He serves as a trustee of the John F. Kennedy Library. He also is a member of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences, is honorary co-chairman of the committee for the endowed chair in Polish studies at the University of Chicago, and is a member of the board of trustees of the National Urban League.

Dr. Gronouski is married to the former Mary Louise Metz, and they have two daughters, Stacy and Julie.

[From the Texas Times, April–May, 1971]

ASSOCIATE DEAN

Dr. Alexander L. Clark, a sociologist who also has training in law, is the associate dean of the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at The University of Texas at Austin.

The associate deanship appointment was effective Sept. 1, 1970.

From 1966 until his present assignment, Dr. Clark was on leave from UT Austin, serving most of that time in the Division of Behavioral Sciences of the National Academy of Sciences. He was executive secretary of the division in 1969–70.

Also while with the National Academy of Sciences, Dr. Clark was executive secretary of an advisory committee to the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of the Interior. In addition, he was executive secretary of a committee concerned with the policy issues and innovations in the biomedical sciences and census enumeration.

Dr. Clark developed and organized advisory activities for the Office of Education, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Department of Transportation, the Department of Labor and the Department of Defense.

Dr. Clark also has a professorship in the UT Austin Sociology Department. He was on that departmental faculty from 1960 to 1966, holding an associate professorship when he went on leave.

A Harvard Law School Fellow in 1966–67, Dr. Clark was educated at San Diego State College (B.A., 1955) and Stanford University (M.A., 1956, and Ph.D., 1960). He had a Woodrow Wilson Fellowship in 1955–56. He taught at the University of Washington during the 1959–60 academic year.

His present interests include governmental social science and social policy, and science policy.

Dr. Clark is married and has four children.

Mr. Speaker, the official dedication ceremonies were, themselves, an event to remember. I would also like to insert newspaper commentaries concerning the events:

[From the Wichita Falls Times, May 19, 1971]

ON DEDICATION OF LBJ LIBRARY

With the formal dedication Saturday of the LBJ Library in the building complex of the University of Texas in Austin also housing the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs for graduate research in the field of political science, Texas will become the mecca for scholars present and future who will want to examine the uniqueness of the man whose political career leading to the nation's highest office has had no contemporary counterpart, if ever in the nation's history.

Texans who know LBJ best and admirers from far places whose paths crossed his during the course of long years at the very nerve center of the federal government are looking forward to Saturday's reunion at the big invitational event in the state's capital city.

It will be a happy occasion of long-time friends getting together again, and Austin will be filled with dignitaries intent on a different purpose from any that might have brought them to Lyndon Johnson, or him to them, during the more than three decades that saddled him with congressional as well as White House duties. There will be no political issues to pare down to a decision, no political favors to seek, no political points to score—only a relaxed atmosphere to enjoy honoring a Texan they respect as "Mr. President."

It is the kind of a party at Austin Saturday that Texans have been hoping might be staged for LBJ ever since he left the White House, and it has been the farsightedness and generosity of their host and center of attraction which is making it possible.

For all that the LBJ Library means to academic achievement, for all that Saturday's events mean to Lyndon B. Johnson and Lady Bird and their family, for all that it means to those who participate, there is still a further meaning.

Texas now has two centers built around its two most distinguished political leaders and citizens, the Sam Rayburn Library at Bonham and the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs and Library at Austin.

The public career of "Mr. Speaker" had qualities which set it apart forever in American political history. That of Lyndon B. Johnson has not been equalled, and is not likely to be, for its different facets. To add to the uniqueness is the fact that much of their life in politics overlapped and bolstered each other's.

At Bonham before, and now at Austin, are enduring monuments of usefulness to two men who have been monumental in their political statesmanship to Texas and the nation.

[From the Washington Post, May 23, 1971]

3,000 UNITE TO DEDICATE LBJ LIBRARY—NIXON STRESSES BIPARTISANSHIP

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

AUSTIN, TEX., May 22.—The biggest bipartisan political assemblage since the 1969 presidential inauguration converged on this Texas capital city today to participate in the dedication of the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library and School of Public Affairs.

The vast turnout to honor the Johnsons included, besides President and Mrs. Nixon and David and Julie Eisenhower, Vice President and Mrs. Agnew, Democratic Sens. Hubert H. Humphrey, who flew here on the Vice President's plane, Edmund S. Muskie, most of the old Johnson Cabinet and White House staff, Secretary of State and Mrs. William P. Rogers, Secretary and Mrs. John B. Connally and scores of members of Congress.

President Johnson, who once thought of calling his administration the "can do" administration, said in his speech that the documents contain million of words, but "the two that best express my philosophy are the words 'Man can.'"

When the President spoke he said that "Mrs. Nixon and I are honored to be here deep in the heart of Texas. The heart of America at this moment today is in the heart of Texas."

[From Dallas Times Herald, May 23, 1971]

VIPs FLOCK TO LIBRARY RITES—NOTABLES OF ALL WALKS OF LIFE PAY LBJ HOMAGE

(By Ernest Stromberger)

President Nixon's address highlighted the ceremony, which marked the transfer of the $18.6 million library complex—the largest and most costly presidential library in the nation—from the University of Texas to the federal government.

Paying a tribute to Johnson as "a vigorous leader of his party," Nixon added that Johnson's partnership went beyond being a party advocate.

"It has been my privilege to know many partisans of principle," Nixon said.

"And I think today especially of those times during the Eisenhower administration, when I was vice president and Lyndon Johnson was majority leader of the Senate, I knew, and President Eisenhower knew, that wherever the great issues of national security were concerned, he would always be a partisan of principle and not a partisan of party—that is Lyndon Baines Johnson."

Recalling the words of U.S. Sen. Albert Beveridge of Indiana in 1898 that "a partisan merely for the sake of a party name is a ghost of the past among living events, but he who is the partisan of principle is a prince of citizenship," Nixon said:

"It is in that same spirit that we are gathered here today to dedicate this library, and in doing so to pay tribute to President Johnson—and to dedicate ourselves to the proposition, as Sen. Albert Beveridge so eloquently put it so long ago, that "the partisan of principle is a prince of citizenship."

[From New York Times, May 23, 1971]

NIXON HAILS JOHNSON LIBRARY AT DEDICATION

(By Martin Waldron)

Mr. Johnson, his graying hair riffing in the 25-mile-an-hour wind, took pains to dispel any idea that he or his staff had winnowed out any of the former President's papers before donating them to the library.

"IT IS ALL HERE"

"It is all here: the story of our time—with the bark off," Mr. Johnson said. "There is no record of a mistake, nothing critical, ugly or unpleasant that is not included in the files here. We have papers from my 40 years of public service in one place, for friends and foe to judge, to approve or disapprove."

[From the Washington Post, May 23, 1971]

POLITICAL ERAS COME TOGETHER

(By David S. Broder)

AUSTIN, TEX., May 22.—It was fathers' and sons'—and grandsons'—day today, as the generations mixed and old allies mingled with old antagonists at the ceremonies and barbecue dedicating Lyndon B. Johnson's presidential library.

The conflict and the continuity of American politics over two generations and five presidencies were all brought together in the crowd of 3,000 men and women who joined Mr. Johnson and President Nixon, those longtime opponents who linked arms for today's pageant.

But mostly it was a day to tell your children about, a kaleidescope of scenes and faces evocative of the extraordinary career of the 36th President, from his roots in the early New Deal to his present role as the overriding presence in this vastly important political realm called Texas.

The early New Dealers were here, "Tommy the Cork" Corcoran, Jim Rowe, David Ginsburg and the others who took the gangly young congressman from Austin into the White House inner circle.

The Johnson Cabinet members were here—reminiscing over the heady days when Great Society legislation was being passed as fast as they could devise it, chatting with each other and moving on, as one of them said,

before the memories revived of how they had waged bureaucratic war on each other.

And so it went for the two hours of mingling and mixing. Old friends. Old enemies. A remarkable gallery of "the great and near great" of American politics, as the Austin paper headlined this morning.

[From the Washington Sunday Star, May 23, 1971]

JOHNSON'S BARBECUE—A PAST MASTER "PRESSES THE FLESH"

(By Isabelle Shelton)

After giving Vice President Agnew and Secretary of State Rogers a post-dedication tour of the library, Johnson swooped up a few close friends—House Speaker Carl Albert, Majority Leader Hale Boggs and his wife Lindy, columnist William S. White and his wife—and also Kissinger—for a quick sampling of the barbecue under the yellow-and-white striped VIP tent.

[From the Austin (Texas) American-Statesman, May 23, 1971]

FAMOUS, FAITHFUL PARADE, PREEN, RENEW FRIENDSHIPS

(By Carolyn Bengtson)

Saturday, the famous and the faithful came for the dedication of Lyndon B. Johnson's Library.

"I never thought I'd come to Austin, Texas, and know half the people I saw," said Sen. Philip Hart of Michigan.

Barry Goldwater was another of the senators on hand, and he was in happy good humor. "No," he smiled, after the dedication, "I didn't have any thought about how that library might have been mine. I quit thinking about that a long time ago. I'm glad it's Lyndon's, and I'm happy to be here.

"I like that man very much, you know. He and I know how to fight and we know how to get along."

Also among those at the dedication was Preston Bruce, who has been chief doorman at the White House for the last four presidents. "I'm proud, very proud, I'm here," he said.

Another there was Ralph E. Becker, who gave the huge collection of political buttons to the LBJ Library. Becker was a political appointee of President Eisenhower and now serves as a trustee for the Kennedy Center. A real collector, he's given more than 80,000 items to the Smithsonian.

He had no hesitation about donating his button collection to LBJ's Library. "Oh, I'm a Republican," he said, "but I worked with President Johnson, and then Lady Bird—well, nobody's left more to our heritage than Lady Bird."

People-watchers were delighted to spy Vice-President Spiro Agnew, Gregory and Veronique Peck, Henry Kissinger, Averill Harriman, Gen. Omar Bradley, Supreme Court Justice Tom Clark and many other well-known faces.

[From the Washington Post, May 24, 1971]

LBJ'S DAY IN AUSTIN

(By Dorothy McCardle)

If D. W. Griffith wanted to film "The Middle-Age of a Nation," he might have done it at the dedication of the Lyndon B. Johnson Library in Austin, Tex., Saturday.

There were the political stars from the New Deal to the Great Society to the Nixon administration—as well as the presidential candidates who are waiting in the wings. They were joined by show business stars, business tycoons and leaders of the academic world.

Following the dedication ceremony everyone gathered under four massive tents for a traditional bit of Americana—a barbecue. After the barbecue many went on to two smaller parties, while others climbed into planes to return to the many parts of America from which they came.

The couple who made the greatest effort to get to the LBJ Library dedication day missed everything but the Krim party.

Former Secretary of Defense and Mrs. Robert S. McNamara arrived after 25 hours in the air on their way home from Africa.

McNamara, now president of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, had been in Ghana at a dinner in his honor Friday night.

Two weeks ago, McNamara wrote LBJ that he could not make the dedication. Johnson was reported to be very upset by this news and sent back word that he counted on McNamara coming.

At the Krim party, McNamara, exhausted from the hectic traveling, said: "I did not want to be the one member of the Johnson Cabinet not to come."

[From the Austin American-Statesman, May 23, 1971]

JOHNSON LIBRARY DEDICATED

Dr. Harry Ransom, chancellor emeritus of the University of Texas System, told the assembled guests the Johnsons themselves have made personal contributions to the library and school totaling approximately $2 million. He valued the working resources of the library between $50 and $60 million.

"By name, Lyndon Baines Johnson is honored here as an American who has given his life to his state, his country, and his fellow men," Ransom said.

He said the library and school should be dedicated to the beliefs: "That this Republic and its history must survive; that their survival is worth our devotion; that our devotion requires not mindless allegiance but loyalty enlightened by knowledge; that this loyalty challenges open minds to defend responsible freedoms; that the future will call upon courage and courage gain strength in a feeling of identity with all peoples."

Rev. Billy Graham delivered the invocation, and Rev. George Davis of the National City Christian Church, Washington, D.C., delivered the benediction.

Former UT Board of Regents chairman Frank C. Erwin, Jr., of Austin presided over the ceremonies.

Other dignitaries on the speakers' platform were Vice-President Spiro T. Agnew, U.S. House speaker Carl Albert, Secretary of State William P. Rogers, Secretary of the Treasury John Connally, Governor Preston Smith, Lt. Gov. Ben Barnes, Texas House Speaker Gus Mutscher, General Services Administration head Robert Kunzig, Archivist of the U.S. James B. Rhoades, library director Harry Middleton, LBJ School Dean Dr. John Gronouski, UT System Chancellor Dr. Charles LeMaistre, and UT Austin President Ad Interim Dr. Bryce Jordan.

L. B. J. GATHERING: WET GUESTS, A BARBEQUE AND LIBRARY CRITICS

(By Dorothy McCardle)

The laughter, the security, even the weather—but most of all the assemblage of some 3,000 invited guests—made for a day which no one present would forget and for which everybody had his own pet name.

Dr. Henry Kissinger, special assistant to the President for national security affairs, summed it up this way:

"It has been a joyous day. Mr. Johnson has really brought us all together."

Lyndon Johnson and his family directed their hospitality to the waiting crowd. They led the way to four enormous tents set up with tables and chairs. But it took them a long and winding way to get to the tent where they were to sit down and have lunch with some of their oldest friends from Washington.

HANDSHAKES AND AUTOGRAPHS

They were stopped constantly to shake hands and sign autographs, and the former President kept promising people like Clarence Mitchell Jr., director of the Washington office of the NAACP, that he would do more than sign his name to the day's program.

"I'm going to send you an autographed copy of my book when it comes out," said LBJ about the story of his White House years to be published in the fall.

Johnson seemed ruddy and relaxed. He has had a haircut, making his hair a lot shorter than it was a week ago. He looked husky in his tan suit with a yellow-striped shirt, brown tie and brown handkerchief.

He finally sat down under a yellow-striped tent, with Lady Bird Johnson sitting across from him and House Majority Leader Hale Boggs and Speaker Carl Albert flanking him. Kissinger sat beside Lady Bird.

Mary Margaret Valenti, wife of former White House special assistant Jack Valenti, came up to speak to the former President. So did Robin Duke, wife of Angier Biddle Duke, former U.S. ambassador to Spain and former U.S. chief of protocol. Rep. Robert Casey of Houston joined them.

Suddenly, Mrs. Johnson glanced at the table behind her, spotted two members of the Supreme Court, and went back in her neighborly way to sit between Justices Hugo L. Black and Thurgood Marshall.

LITTLE TIME TO EAT

The Johnsons were so busy "visiting" with all the friends who came by that they had no time to do more than nibble their platters heaped with fried chicken, brisket, barbecued ribs, sausage, beans, potato salad, sliced pickles and onions. This feast had been prepared on the grounds by Martin Jetton, the barbecue king of Texas.

"It bothers me architecturally," said Harriman. "It's too big. I don't see any purpose in wasting all this space."

Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey disagreed emphatically. "I think it's magnificent."

Simone Poulain, former assistant to Mrs. Johnson at the White House, confided to Humphrey that she had overheard someone say that the crowd "seemed like the government in exile."

"Oh, no," said Humphrey. "This is a government in preparation. You've heard of recycling, haven't you?"

[From the New York Times, May 24, 1971]

AND THE FOOD WAS PLENTIFUL

(By Raymond A. Sokolov)

AUSTIN, Texas, May 23.—Richard Nixon accepted the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library "for America," but he did not accept the University of Texas' invitation to a mammoth barbecue held after the dedication ceremony on campus here yesterday. Instead he had some of the chicken and ribs fixed up as a sort of carry-out order and ate them on Air Force One enroute to Key Biscayne, Fla.

According to some reports, the airborne barbecue wasn't nearly as succulent as the victuals served fresh to more than 4,000 lesser guests on the ground. In any case, that crowd had quite a lunch. It was definitely Texas-size and bore the L.B.J. brand. The caterers, the Walter Jetton Company of Fort Worth, prepared many large barbecues in the past for Lyndon Johnson and is just as much a relic of his Administration as the papers in the Library.

The Jetton (pronounced like Baton) shopping list ran as follows: 1,800 pounds of sliced barbecue beef brisket, 1,500 pounds of barbecue ribs, 800 pounds of Polish sausage, 600 barbecue chickens, one half ton each of Ranch Beans, Country Potato Salad and Texas Cole Slaw, 2,000 sweet onions, 8,064 sourdough biscuits with butter, 60 gallons of dill pickle spears, 150 gallons of iced tea,

50 gallons of coffee and 4,500 fried apple pies.

As for Lady Bird Johnson, the barbecue made her think of "my favorite barbecues down under the live oaks on the banks of the Pedernales. When I think of them, I see a long montage of old friends, a lifetime of home."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 24, 1971]

LBJ BACK ON POLITICAL MAP FOR A DAY

(By Courtney R. Sheldon)

LBJ, the vanished Texan, behaves in the high tradition of ex-presidents in a nuclear age. In foreign policy, peace, and war issues, the fraternity of former presidents rallies round the current lonely occupant of the oval office in the White House.

The great divide of domestic politics and personalities between present and past presidents also can be finessed.

Hs is not, however, ever completely out of mind in the White House. The Nixon administration keeps him—and former President Truman—briefed on national security and foreign policy matters and there are courtesy consultations.

Speaking in front of the magnificent, monumental library, Mr. Nixon reminisced, "The easy questions are not the ones that come to the President: those are decided at other levels."

A proud and unchanged LBJ told the friends he selected for the occasion, "A president sees things from a unique perspective. No one can share his responsibility. No one can share the scope of his duties or the burden of his decisions."

Mr. Johnson surely speaks for all former presidents in these times.

[From the Nashville Banner, May 24, 1971]

IN STALWART AMERICANISM LBJ STANDS TALL

In words of tribute—a message from the heart—spoken Saturday to an esteemed predecessor, President Nixon was expressing his own sentiment, and the nation's, to Lyndon Baines Johnson. Appropriately, they were flowers to the living, for services rendered, within present memory.

He was helping dedicate a library that is the centerpiece of the stately new 8-story complex on the Texas University campus—the official assembly place of records, papers, and memorabilia from a remarkable career of 40 years in the service of his country.

Only in America could there have been such inter-party sharing of such occasion.

No one could better comprehend the dimensions and weight of the responsibilities borne by a President who was—prior to that, a member of the House of Representatives, a U.S. Senator, a Vice-President. For Mr. Nixon has occupied each of these offices; was a colleague of LBJ in Congress, and assumed the Presidential burdens as his instant successor.

Their mutual respect has been evident—on the part of each a non-partisan attitude that stems, with their common experience, from a realization of national interest vastly surpassing considerations of either narrow partisanship or personal vanity. They are of that caliber, Americans who put their country first.

The people of the United States never have been unanimous in political conviction: for it is a land of freedom, whose very concept of that begins with the right of political self-determination. They did not all support the candidacy of Lyndon B. Johnson, nor agree with his decisions and course of action respecting either domestic or foreign affairs. But by and large there was substantial and vastly majority agreement with the unassailable fact of his solid Americanism, his courage of conviction, integrity of purpose, and dedication of heart and mind and hand to the national security and welfare, and for world peace, as he saw these to be.

The same qualities are resident in Richard Nixon—and for the success of his tenure, and for the chance to follow through in America's behalf, with the prerogatives that are his by assignment as a public trust, Mr. Johnson repeatedly has admonished both sides of the national political firmament. His advice has been effective for fairness and standards of decent attitude on those within his own party, save those on the far left—the chronic needlers, and particularly those nursing ambition's far-fetched bee in their own undersized bonnets.

These were the ones for the most part who initiated on their own Democratic side of the fence, their own 1968 Dump-Johnson drive—the campaign of harassment, on the Senate floor, and with scuttling drives against foreign policy—that eventuated in Mr. Johnson's televised announcement on Mar. 31, that he would not be a candidate for another term as President.

By and large they are the same ones who for the same basic reasons—policy-scuttling purposes, and lack of sympathy with security operations matched only by their own ambitions—are striving to drive Mr. Nixon out of office. They did not represent the American constituency in those days of crucial decision in 1968, and they do not now.

As the elder statesman of his party, Lyndon Johnson stands tall. From the perspective that is clearer in the passing years, his is a remarkable stature in the eyes and affiections of his country—a great and good American; a stalwart figure in its history, so much of which in his own generation he helped write.

As President Nixon so aptly put it, in the crucial issues that have confronted his country, Lyndon Baines Johnson has been above partisanship, and is partisan only to principle. His example in that particular is the most distinguished attribute to acknowledge in any library, to enshrine in the heart, or to leave as a legacy to American generations unborn.

[From the Washington Daily News, May 24, 1971]

LBJ GOT THINGS DONE

(By Ernest B. Furgurson)

AUSTIN, TEX.—Long before the dedication of the L.B.J. library here, they were calling it "Lyndon's mausoleum" and referring to the event itself as his resurrection. Then the scale of the ceremonies and the accompanying barbecue encouraged just that many more wisecracks about the man who has replaced Herbert Hoover as the favorite butt of American political disparagement.

That began because of his 10-gallon-personality of course but it grew and continues because so many widely quoted wits place him in one context only—that of the man who escalated the Vietnamese war. It is time, now that he has been quietly retired at the ranch for more than two years, to recover from the monomania that equated him with the war and nothing else—time to consider his record in early perspective.

When John Kennedy was killed, I was stationed in Moscow. Not only the American community there, but many other foreigners and Russians too, knew John Kennedy better than they had any other American president, and they were crushed and fearful. They knew virtually nothing about his successor, except that he was from Texas and that was where Mr. Kennedy had been slain. The conspiracy theories of the assassination found uncommon receptivity there.

Because I was the only person there who had covered Mr. Johnson in the Senate and as a vice-presidential candidate—who knew him—friend after friend came to me to ask what kind of President he would be, what we could expect now.

I knew him in the Senate as the man who got things done, most often by compromise. I knew him as a candidate who spoke out on the issues, but whose main function was to hold the South behind the Democratic ticket. I also knew that John Kennedy had asked Congress for broad civil-rights legislation but had been reluctant to press too hard for its passage lest he jeopardize action on his other "New Frontier" bills.

My feeling was that the first test of whether Lyndon Johnson as president intended to play politics or lead the nation would be whether he committed himself to passage of that civil-rights package or contented himself with a congressionally watered-down alternative. I told my friends in Moscow they might judge him the same way.

He exceeded all my expectations, and perhaps even his own.

He threw his full weight behind the civil-rights bill of 1964 and it turned out even stronger than Mr. Kennedy had proposed it the year before. In one sweep, it was the most far-reaching civil-rights legislation since Reconstruction. It covered voting, public accommodations, education, federal projects, employment and many other areas. It could not have been passed without the total commitment of the man in the White House.

Inspired by that success and the election results of 1964, he involved himself even more emotionally in the effort to guarantee voting rights. Standing in the House chamber in 1965 before a special joint session of Congress, he used the words of the anthem of the civil-rights movement, "We shall overcome," to summon the legislators to act. Five months later, he was at the Capitol again to sign the milestone bill beside a statute of Abraham Lincoln in the Rotunda.

Many years earlier, the black historian, W.E.B. DuBois, had written that "Despite everything, the Fifteenth Amendment and that alone struck the death knell of slavery." But the Fifteenth Amendment did not begin taking nationwide effect until it was put into specific law in August, 1965, with a stroke of Lyndon Johnson's pen on the voting rights bill.

Since then, the number of black Americans registered to vote has multiplied manifold, especially in the South. The number holding elected office has climbed even faster. Some day those figures will be in proportion to the black percentage of our population, and the Fifteenth Amendment will be a reality instead of a promise.

When it is, one of the Americans most responsible will be a Texan, a man who grew up in a latitude south of every state capital in Dixie and who dragged through Congress the greatest flood of social legislation in our history. Antipoverty war, Medicare, aid to education, the Great Society—the list of accomplishments in the Johnson years runs on. Walter Lippmann, who could never be accused of a bias toward Mr. Johnson, wrote that "he's done what President Kennedy could not have done had he lived."

And the single field in which his impress was greatest was civil rights, wherein he proved that it is a great mistake to judge a man by his accent.

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, May 23, 1971]

LBJ—GETTING PLAUDITS HE DESERVES

(By Robert E. Thompson)

NEW YORK.—Everyone who ever has been in Lyndon Johnson's private presence probably has groped for words to describe him. The adjectives usually are the same: intelligent, tough, expansive, arrogant, domineer-

ing, compassionate, folksy, loquacious, perceptive.

But I can think of no better brief description to fit this remarkable man than one that was uttered in private recently by a wise and venerable American diplomat who has served every President since Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Sitting across a luncheon table in a foreign capital discussing his personal fondness for Dwight Eisenhowever and Harry Truman, his respect for John Kennedy and Richard Nixon, and his disenchantment with FDR, the diplomat suddenly said: "But Lyndon Johnson is the most overwhelming man I've ever met."

Almost anyone who ever has spent any time with Johnson, alone or in a small group, can agree with those words. He is a man in whom everything is magnified—his physical bearing, his personal characteristics, his conversational manner, his kindness and his anger. Lyndon Johnson, quite simply, is not a man to do things in small ways.

It should come as no surprise, therefore, that the LBJ Library which was dedicated this weekend in Austin, Tex., is the most impressive and costly of all the presidential libraries in this nation. It is an institution to match the man.

Lyndon Johnson, who first went to Washington from Texas during the Hoover administration and then watched at close hand the presidencies of Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy, has for years been concerned about his own destiny and his own place in history.

As if to leave nothing to chance, he started during his presidency to restore his birthplace on the LBJ ranch and his boyhood home in Johnson City as public monuments. He and Mrs. Johnson also began in those years to chart plans for the LBJ Library and the LBJ School of Public Affairs on the University of Texas campus.

It may be too early to know how history will judge Lyndon Johnson. But whatever the judgment, the physical memorials to his fantastic years of service to his state and nation now are intact in that rugged, rolling corner of America that is his home country.

There still are many in this land who regard Lyndon Johnson as the devil incarnate because he escalated our involvement in Vietnam, because he sent in troops to quell rebellion in the Dominican Republic, or because he successfully fostered a monumental package of social and economic reforms that made the federal government a bold participant in educational, ecological, racial and urban matters.

In ordering bombers and troops into Vietnam, Johnson sought to follow through on basic commitments made by Eisenhower and Kennedy and to turn back the tide of Communist aggression. He, like those who advised him, including the military high command, sincerely believed their objective of a solution to the Vietnamese problem could be accomplished in a short time. At the time he made his fateful decision, the whole psychology of the cold war dictated that America not stand on the sidelines, Neville Chamberlain style, and watch an ally go down the drain.

On the domestic front, he won a 20-year battle for federal aid to education and medical care for the aged. He created new parks and recreational areas for the people. He sharply accelerated the government's efforts to clean up air and water pollution. He fathered important programs to help rehabilitate our cities.

As Senator and then as President, Johnson compiled the finest civil rights record of any public servant this nation has ever known. He was the only President to make a really serious effort to give Mexican-Americans a voice in their government.

As ex-President, he has conducted himself impeccably. He has not sought to undercut his successor, despite their partisan differences. Instead, last week he jumped into the battle on Nixon's side to prevent the Senate from arbitrarily voting a reduction in American forces committed to NATO.

This was an old role to which Johnson reverted. During the years of the Eisenhower Presidency, when he was Senate Majority Leader, Johnson repeatedly put partisanship aside to save the President's programs in areas of foreign policy and national defense.

Lyndon Johnson is an overwhelming man. One might see in him traces of Andrew Jackson's frontier flamboyance, Harry Truman's rural folksiness, FDR's autocratic manner or Abraham Lincoln's backwoods humor. But for the most part he is a vividly unique and highly individualistic human being, quite unlike any other man who ever sat in the White House.

While many of his contemporaries are determined to focus only upon his mistakes, historians of the future must give full measure also to his remarkable achievements. In the meantime, no fair American should begrudge Lyndon Johnson the plaudits that have been heaped upon him this weekend by thousands of friends and associates.

[From the San Antonio Express, May 22, 1971]

VIP DAY IN AUSTIN AN APPROPRIATE ACCOLADE FOR THE JOHNSON YEARS

This is VIP Day in Austin.

Dignitaries by the score will be there to help dedicate the Lyndon B. Johnson Library at the University of Texas. The library will house papers from a 38-year public service career that covered this country's most exciting and, in many ways, most significant years of history.

The Johnson papers will help historians tell this country's story in the years to come and they will be the source for tracing the main historic patterns.

Dignitaries will be on hand for more reasons than that, however. Congressman-Senator-Vice President, President Johnson is a man who dealt on unusually-intimate personal terms with people in government. Indeed, as Senate majority leader, some of his critics complained that his kind of leadership discouraged debate. Yet, his kind of leadership touched persons and that so many have accepted invitations to Austin suggests the contacts were lasting.

The Johnsons, Lyndon and Lady Bird, have a keen sense of history. That is why the collection in the new library is so large. They have a keen appreciation for scholarly research. That is why the library has been planned to be so complete. They have an everlasting pride in their home state. That is why the library is located in Austin, and why Mr. Johnson has planned to be personally involved in teaching there, himself.

The library will become a memorial, quite naturally, but it is first a working research facility that covers a great American era. The VIP crowd acknowledges that along with a deserved accolade for the Johnsons.

[From the Nashville Banner, May 22, 1971]

LIBRARY UNIQUE ON WARM SIDE

(By Jack Knox)

Notes from Austin, Tex., "LBJ Country."

The Lyndon Baines Johnson Library, all eight floors of it, is everything the news stories have proclaimed and photographers have pictured.

In size, in the scope of its contents, in elegance and arrangement, with its electronic audio-visual supplements, it is a library unmatched in the United States—or in the world, we are told.

Along with John Morgan, chief photographer of The Nashville Banner, my wife and I were permitted to preview the interior while staff members and technicians rushed the work of having everything completed and in order in time for the dedication ceremonies and subsequent opening to the public.

But to see and hear and appreciate all of it would require days rather than hours. For it contains the minutely detailed record of the man and his time, four decades of Lyndon Johnson's public life, politics, major episodes and turning points in American and world history. And too, it is flavored with memorabilia of sentiment such as: A telegram to his daughter Luci denoting with good humor his excitement over the birth of young Patrick Lyndon Nugent . . . a letter to him from "Bird" as she reassures him that he, too, is a brave man, as brave as the 35 who preceded him. These, and other tangible items, tend to show the warm side of this man in his family and public life.

One impression expressed by my wife sticks in my mind. "When we visited the Truman Library several years ago," she said, "I had the feeling it was all history. Here, I have the same feeling of history but I also have the feeling that Lyndon Johnson's public life is unfinished. That it ends here with a comma rather than with a period. And I wonder."

Chatting with people in Austin and out in the "hill country," mention of the Library is a good springboard for talk on the subject of LBJ.

"I don't know for sure the way to address him now," said a lanky Texan in the hotel coffee shop, "but 'President Johnson' sounds mighty good to me. Nope. I'm not one of those old-line Johnson people, and I bucked hard against a whole lot of his 'Great Society' push. But in the couple of years since he came home from Washington my thinkin' has mellowed considerable. Same with a good many of us, and I'd say Ol' Lyndon's popularity would top-out plenty high if it was measured."

The driver of a pickup truck at a market on the edge of town said: "They tell me this dedication is attractin' the biggest gatherin' of political wheels since the Democrat Convention in Houston in '28. I listened to that one on the radio with an earphone and that was the first time I ever heard a radio.

"So you're a cartoonist, eh? You ought to draw that Democrat donkey bendin' an ear to Ol' Lyndon. He can tell 'em a thing or two about politics and gover'ment. And you better believe it, too!"

Is Lyndon Johnson's retirement really permanent? His friends with whom I've talked hedge the question. Most of them say they wouldn't have believed he could have relaxed and retired for this long—two years and four months. But his political opponents are fearful. What could the pressures of public opinion do? What if the Democrats take their convention to Houston in '72? "Johnson-watchers" hereabouts are keeping their eyes peeled.

Stopping in Johnson City, Tex., for gasoline, directions, and a bit of conversation, a man in the filing station said to me, "This is Lyndon Johnson's boyhood home, you know. I sort of grew up with him around here. And lookin' back to when we was boys, I reckon I had as much chance to be President as he did. That's the beauty-part about this country of ours, a man can grow big if he's got the stuff in him."

As folks see him these days, "Lyndon Johnson's got the stuff. He's plenty of a man, And that library is proof of it!"

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE) and a Member of the other body are placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today references to the dedication of the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library and School of Public Affairs in Austin, Tex., on May 22, last. Having been present for the occasion, I would like to urge my colleagues who were not

present to read the proceedings of this memorable event.

The speeches that were made—and I include the opening and closing prayers—were magnificent and heart warming and I wish every American could have heard them. I am pleased that many who did not hear them will have an opportunity to read them in the RECORD.

The library and school are strategically located on the campus of a great university and they will mean much to Texas and the Nation in the coming years.

Warmest congratulations and best wishes to Lyndon and Lady Bird Johnson and may their hopes and dreams for the library and school be fully realized. And I think they will.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, with many Texans doing honor to their most famous citizens and with others from over the land—my wife and I attended the L.B.J. Library dedication—a very impressive, yet informal, affair. The whole event was an expression of America and all it signifies.

There was the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, members of the Nixon cabinet, mingling with members of the Johnson cabinet, with friends from everywhere joining the former President and his lovely lady to do them the honor they so justly earned on this great day of their lives.

These were the forerunners of the students, analysts, authors, philosophers—of the thousands in the future who will pour into the L. B. J. Library to pore over the L. B. J. papers to write their version of the history he has made.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for many years that I do like to remember, starting when I was a desk-mate of Sam Johnson, and when his boy, Lyndon, was as tall as a full-grown man at the age of 12, I have known that L. B. J. had a certain definite genius for persuasive communication.

The Johnsons, like the Patmans, were accustomed to spending a large part of their Sundays in church, and it follows that in his youth, the 36th President of the United States was told, with Bible authority, how the evils of this world were compounded at the Tower of Babel when communication among human beings sank to its all-time nadir. It would follow that one of the most noble pursuits of mankind is the meaningful exchange of knowledge among people and among nations.

One evening some years ago while I was at home in my Washington apartment working on a statement for a committee meeting, there was a telephone call followed by almost instant commotion in the building corridors, and I was privileged to welcome President Johnson and his lovely, charming wife, both accompanied by their favorite hound, for whom the building superintendent had graciously waived strict house rules against the presence of pets. At this meeting, I concurred enthusiastically with the President's plan for an L. B. J. Library at Austin and I agreed to donate my own accumulation of papers and documents in esse and in futuro as a part of this wonderful undertaking. I am happy at this time to confirm my intent, and to assure President Johnson that the Patman papers in their entirety will be added to the remarkable collection already assembled. With this explanatory background it was of course a great and special honor to witness and participate in the dedication of the L. B. J. Library on the 22d of May, 1971, an event of tremendous significance to Texas, to America and to all the world. This library is our commitment to an ultimate in excellence in the exchange of thoughts among men of good will. It was a particularly proud moment to be an American, a Texan, and a lifelong friend of the Lyndon Johnson family. Truly I consider this television ceremony, carrying the words of Presidents Johnson and Nixon, the finest 30 minutes in the history of Texas.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, history will undoubtedly prove that Lyndon Baines Johnson's administration, guided by compassion and human understanding, contributed more to the economic and social progress of this Nation than any other Presidential administration in the history of our country. It is indeed fitting that the record of his administration be preserved for scholars throughout the ages to study this most significant period of our national development.

Located on the campus of the University of Texas, the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library stands as a magnificent reaffirmation of man's urge for civilized development. In conjunction with the library, the Lyndon Baines Johnson School of Public Affairs will dedicate its efforts to the training of young men and women for the public service of our Nation. All Americans should take great pride in the Presidential library system and its contribution to our understanding of America's progress as a free Nation.

The Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Library will stand through the ages as a living memorial to all Americans who are concerned with the quality of human life and the uplifting of the human spirit.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this subject.

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

There was no objection.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, today, June 10, marks the 50th anniversary of the creation by Congress of the U.S. General Accounting Office and the Office of the Comptroller General who heads it. I wish to salute the Comptroller General, his associates, and all of the dedicated employees of this indispensable arm of the Congress.

The General Accounting Office is not only an indispensable agency of the Congress but in my judgment is also one of the finest in Government. If we did not have the GAO we would have to immediately create one. It helps Congress fulfill the high duty of monitoring the administration of appropriations to operate the Government and thus helps Congress in its continuing responsibility for seeing that executive departments and agencies keep faith with the laws and undertake to secure a dollar in value for each dollar expended.

The Committee on Appropriations is but one of the various congressional committees making extensive use of GAO facilities. Probably not a week passes that somewhere in a room of the Committee on Appropriations either a member or the staff is not making some use of one of the several hundred GAO audit and analytical reports submitted each year to the Congress. These reports, reflecting the results of GAO monitoring of the use of appropriations, are of high value to the indispensable duty of Congress to exercise continuous oversight of the administration of appropriated funds. The GAO, as the independent eyes and ears of Congress, so to speak, importantly helps discharge this role.

Created by Congress as an independent, nonpartisan, nonpolitical agency, I know of no one—in or out of Congress—who thinks the Comptroller General pulls his punches. The GAO calls the shots as it sees them—in the current vernacular, they tell it like it is. They have a reputation for unimpeachable integrity.

Mr. Speaker, it was Emerson who observed that institutions are but the lengthened shadows of men. The General Accounting Office has been headed by men of outstanding ability and devotion to the public interest. From Elmer Staats, the present Comptroller General, on back through my experience in the Congress, Comptrollers General have been men of great devotion to duty, dedicated to zealously maintaining one of the key aims of the Congress of 50 years ago, which was to equip itself with an independent facility to serve as a nonpartisan and reliable source of assistance in carrying out its constitutional responsibility for the use of the public moneys.

Mr. Speaker, as the Federal Government proliferates and Federal expenditures continue to mount, the need for the GAO increases; the burdens upon it increase yearly. It has many important duties and responsibilities beyond its audit and reporting responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I thought it appropriate to take this time to express deep appreciation to this institution for its half century of good and faithful service, for the high quality of its work, for its unimpeachable integrity, and for the leadership provided by the Comptroller General, including the distinguished incumbent whose job is perhaps the most difficult of all who have served in that capacity.

CONGRESSMAN STRATTON URGES THAT THE PRESIDENT TAKE THE B–70 OUT OF THE AIR MUSEUM AND USE IT TO TEST THE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE SST

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from the International Air Show in Paris, where I saw both the Soviet TU–144 and the French Concorde, the two operational foreign SST's.

What struck me most was that both airplanes, especially the Soviet TU–144, have borrowed very, very heavily from the B–70, America's prototype for a new manned bomber that was built by us and then rejected in the 1960's. The one remaining copy of that B–70 sits today in the Air Museum at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton, Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, since both the Soviet and the French SST's are now obviously in existence and are going to be operating in the future, whatever we in the Congress may or may not do in the years ahead, and since the major popular argument against an American SST has been the environmental issue, it does seem highly desirable that we proceed as rapidly as possible to find our own answers to all the perplexing environmental questions that have been raised in connection with SST operations in the upper atmosphere. In fact this was one of the things the two prototype SST's were going to be able to do for us, before Congress shot the whole project down.

But now that it is so obvious that our ill-starred supersonic bomber of the 1960's is the working model for this first generation of foreign SST's, I believe we have a unique opportunity to get the answers to all these environmental questions, without waiting any further, simply by making use of our own original American supersonic aircraft.

I am informed that there are no insurmountable problems involved in getting the B–70 out of the air museum and getting it flying again. After all, the Federal taxpayers did spend about $1.5 billion developing 2 prototype B–70's. The first one crashed through no fault of its own. So here is a marvelous chance for the taxpayers to get some of their original investment back by using the remaining aircraft for high altitude environmental research in supersonic flight.

Even a superficial examination of the TU–144 and its engines shows a marked similarity to the B–70. The statistics are even more remarkable. The B–70 is 192 feet in length, the TU–144 180 feet. The B–70's wingspan is 105 feet, the TU–144's is 81 feet. The B–70 cruises at 2,000 m.p.h.; the TU–144 at 1,550 m.p.h. The service ceiling of the B–70 is 75,000 feet; the ceiling of the TU–144 has not been made public, but the Concorde, which is comparable, is 65,000 feet. And the maximum range of all three planes is around 4,000 miles.

Surely it would be the easiest thing in the world to put the B–70 flying back and forth in the lower troposphere, where the SST's will be regularly operating, and find out once and for all whether the nitric oxide chain reaction which some of the scientists have claimed would result from SST operations, would actually occur and would actually destroy the protective layer of ozone in the upper atmosphere that shelters us from excessive exposure to the ultraviolet rays of the sun.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have today written a letter to President Nixon bringing these facts to his attention, and urging him, both as President and as Commander in Chief, to release the B–70 from the Air Museum, and turn it over to the FAA and the Environmental Protection Agency to serve as a high altitude flying laboratory to settle once and for all the various environmental questions raised with regard to the SST, especially the matter of the skin cancer threat.

If the environmental problems prove to be insurmountable, then we will know that it will not be safe for us to proceed any further with any American SST development, whether public or private; and we can also make this information available to the rest of the world for appropriate response in connection with their own SST operations.

On the other hand, if the skin cancer and other environmental hazards that have been suggested prove not to be valid on the basis of the data picked up by this flying laboratory, then we will be in a much better position, when the economic situation permits, to resume the American effort to build a second generation SST that will prove far more efficient and very possibly may be able to take over from these early generation foreign models the predominant American leadership in supersonic jet transport aircraft which we presently hold in the subsonic field.

MALCOLM X COLLEGE

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, education has long been regarded as the most potent of all liberating forces. The great majority of people have felt that with education, rational solutions to universal conflicts and problems could be found.

One of the outstanding educational institutions in Chicago, the Malcolm X College, at 1900 West Van Buren Street, has made available to the young people of our city the opportunity to secure this education.

For too long education has been the privilege of the well-born elite, but increasingly, with institutions of the caliber and capacity of Malcolm X College, economic barriers have been removed and the opportunity for higher education has been made available to all young people on an expanding basis.

Recently, the college moved to a new $21 million facility, and both as the Congressman for the Seventh District of Illinois where Malcolm X College is located, and as a former teacher in the Chicago public schools, I am tremendously proud of the fine contribution this institution is making toward providing opportunities for educational advancement in the inner city.

I extend my warmest congratulations to Dr. Charles G. Hurst, Jr., president of Malcolm X College, to the faculty, and to the students on occupying their new facility, and my best wishes for continuing growth and advancement, not only in education but in service to the people of the community as well.

Mr. Speaker, recently radio station WLS in Chicago broadcast an editorial comment on Malcolm X College, and I call this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

CONGRATULATIONS, MALCOLM X COLLEGE

Students and faculty members at Malcolm X College have moved into a new building as streamlined as their new-day approach to education. And we at WLS congratulate them.

Their beautiful structure on the city's west side is well-deserved after many months of working to carry on as a unique learning institution despite limited facilities.

But even with that 21-million dollar building, the most outstanding thing about Malcolm X College is the expressed concern for the individual student. And the experience that comes in being educated at a school that so embraces the apparently-elusive principles of freedom, justice, and equality.

The school is moving ahead in spite of criticism and misunderstanding. We believe Malcolm X Community College has a campus and a program of which the entire city can be proud.

CHILDHOOD LEAD POISONING—19 MAJOR HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORT FUNDING OF LEAD-BASED PAINT POISONING PREVENTION ACT

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, Public Law 91–695, authorizes a total of $30 million to fight childhood lead poisoning for fiscal year 1972. In very few instances could $30 million—the cost of just two F–14 jet fighters—be so well spent. Childhood lead poisoning is more prevalent today than was polio prior to the development of the Salk vaccine.

Nineteen major national organizations have organized to form the Coalition for Health Funding to press for funding the act, as well as other health legislation. The coalition includes:

American Academy of Pediatrics;
American Association of Colleges of Osteopathic Medicine;
American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy;
American Association of Dental Schools;
American Dental Association;
American Heart Association, Inc.;
American Nurses Association;
American Optometric Association;
American Public Health Association;
Association of American Medical Colleges;
Association of Schools and Colleges of Optometry;
Association of Schools of the Allied Health Professions;

Association of State and Territorial Health Officers;
Association of University Programs in Hospital Administration;
National Committee Against Mental Illness;
National Council of Community Mental Health Centers;
National Tuberculosis and Respiratory Disease Association; and
Planned Parenthood—World Population.

All of these organizations have, through the Coalition for Health Funding which they comprise, joined to support funding the Lead-Based Paint Prevention Act. Specifically, the Coalition urges funding of the grants programs authorized under the act which are to be implemented by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. That funding, is, needless to say, urgently needed.

PROGRESS TOWARD A MENTALLY HEALTHY AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ROY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, in the field of mental health, no name stands more proudly than that of Menninger. Beginning with the late Dr. Charles F. Menninger, this family has provided national leadership in the fight for effective and dignified treatment for those with mental disorders.

Dr. Charles and his sons, Dr. Karl and Dr. Will, founded the world-renowned Menninger Clinic and Foundation in Topeka, Kans. With these institutions, they pioneered in treating mental and physical disorders in a community-clinic setting.

The foundation is a nonprofit organization for psychiatic treatment, training and research, and for the prevention of mental illness. It helps give psychiatric training in the Topeka Veterans' Administration Hospital, the Topeka State Hospital, and others. It conducts research and runs a department for children, an industrial mental-health program, and a marriage counseling training program.

Dr. Karl serves today as chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Menninger Foundation. He is a giant in the psychiatric profession. His writings, teaching, and research activities have provided much of the impetus in recent decades for the improvement of hospital facilities for psychiatric care and for greater individual and personal attention toward mental patients.

Today, at 78, he continues his activities on behalf of enlightened psychiatry with the enthusiasm of a recent recruit to the struggle and the wisdom of the experienced leader that he is.

The late Dr. Will Menninger was perhaps best known for his service as chief consultant on psychiatry to the Surgeon General of the U.S. Army during World War II, for which he was presented the Distinguished Service Medal.

His special interests were in the fields of industrial and preventive psychiatry. He served the Menninger Foundation for many years as its general secretary.

Today a third generation of Menningers is continuing the work that has meant so much to this country. For doctors seeking training, for all concerned citizens seeking guidance, and above all, for the ill seeking health, the Menninger name remains the brightest beacon lighting this Nation's path toward mental health.

As a physician, I have been aware of the contributions of the Menningers for many years. They have made Topeka one of the most psychiatric-minded communities in America.

As a Congressman, I have become aware of the esteem in which the family is held in all parts of the country. I have also become aware of the interest of Congress in the field of mental health. In fact, this month we celebrate the 25th anniversary of the National Mental Health Act.

Since 1946, Congress has taken other important steps which have advanced the cause of the mentally ill. Much remains to be done. As a physician, I hope to help develop Federal programs which will insure that the enlighted psychiatric techniques of the Menningers receive the widest possible dissemination.

Recognizing the interest of this body in the fight against mental illness, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the William C. Menninger memorial lecture delivered by Mr. Mike Gorman at the recent annual meeting of the Menninger Foundation.

Mr. Gorman, executive director of the National Committee Against Mental Illness, needs no introduction to most Members of Congress. For more than a quarter of a century, he has labored to bring the plight of the mentally ill to public attention. He began as a reporter for the Daily Oklahoman in Oklahoma City in 1945, and 3 years later was the first newspaperman in the country to receive the coveted Lasker Foundation Award for "public information leading to public action."

He has lectured widely and written numerous books and articles. He has worked with both the executive and legislative branches of our national government to initiate Federal action on behalf of mental health. He had major influence on the landmark Community Mental Health Centers Act of 1963.

Mr. Gorman's remarks, entitled "Psychiatry: From Isolation to Involvement," are an excellent presentation of the progress in the field of psychiatry since World War II. They should be required reading for anyone interested in the ideals of the Menningers, that is, for all of us.

Since 1919, when the Menninger Clinic was founded, America has come a long way in its recognition and treatment of the mentally ill. We still have a long way to go. With the help of men like the Menningers and Mike Gorman, we may yet reach a goal men have plodded toward for centuries—a healthy society, in both mind and body.

The item follows:

PSYCHIATRY: FROM ISOLATION TO INVOLVEMENT

I feel very comfortable and nostalgic in returning once again to Topeka and to the Menninger Foundation, which I have canonized in my theological tracts as the Vatican of American psychiatry.

When I began touring the mental hospitals of Oklahoma in 1945, I couldn't believe—as I found out later—that the barbarous, inhumane treatment of patients in these cumbrous institutions was in any way representative of conditions in the rest of the country. In an attempt to gain some perspective and balance, I made a number of trips to Topeka. I spent many hours touring the Topeka State Hospital and the Winter Veterans Administration Hospital, but I spent many more hours communing with, and learning from, Drs. Will and Karl Menninger.

I remember a conversation late one evening in the fall of 1947. The three of us had just finished a day of going through Topeka State; I made the observation that it was painfully similar to the concentration camps for mental patients in Oklahoma. Dr. Will nodded his assent, then began to reminisce about his experiences as Chief of the Physchiatric Division of the Army Medical Corps in World War II.

"When I took over", he said, "the Army thought of psychiatry largely in terms of the disposal of psychotics."

In his characteristically pragmatic way, Dr. Will had gotten to the heart of the matter. Until we altered this sentiment deeply rooted in the American people and in their elected representatives, we would make very little progress.

Here in Kansas, you began the first rethinking of what a public mental institution should be. When Drs. Will, Karl and I went to visit Governor Frank Carlson in 1948 our mission was to convince him that, with the aid of the Menninger Clinic, you could transform a custodial snake pit into a genuine psychiatric hospital where patients could be intensively treated and returned to their communities. Governor Carlson bought the concept, and the rest is history.

There was a second consequential dividend accruing from my Topeka experience. The Winter VA Hospital, then a ramshackle collection of wooden Army barracks, was gradually evolving into a first-rate hospital which would prove that you could maintain a high standard of psychiatric care in a publicly supported institution if your treatment goals were clear and if your funds were adequate.

However, the past dies hard. Those of us who went up and down this land walking through the dark wards of these institutions were frequently bitterly attacked for what we wrote. We were unduly alarming families of mental patients, we were casting aspersions upon the medical profession, we were creating false hopes which never could be realized, and so the bill of particulars ran.

It was a long, hard, fiercely-contested battle. The large mental hospitals—monasteries of the mad—dominated the psychiatric landscape in a most oppressive manner. Many superintendents—self-anointed Keepers of the Keys—rattled them in defiance at those few progressive spirits trying to smuggle a breath of the community beyond the feudal walls. An English psychiatrist, after visiting some of our intimate hospitals in the 10,000-bed range, described them as "like Victorian castles washed out by the sea and deposited on remote sandbanks."

Because they were not intensive treatment facilities—because their overseers were arrogantly indifferent to the social welfare reforms sweeping across other parts of the body politic after World War II—the seemingly inevitable yearly increase in the resident census of these institutions continued, and even accelerated. In the period from 1945 to 1955 alone, 130,000 additional mental patients were jammed into the already overcrowded wards of our state hospitals.

New York State in 1954 had five mental

hospitals in the 10,000 bed range and one—Pilgrim State—with more than 15,000 beds. Yet, in that very same year, the late Governor Thomas Dewey proposed—and succeeded in passing—a $300,000,000 bond issue to add more beds to the existing psychiatric real estate.

I became increasingly convinced that the only way to break the hold of a strongly entrenched custodial philosophy was through a direct political effort. Therefore, our time and attention was increasingly devoted to the State Governors, either as individuals or through their regional and national conferences, and to the state legislators. This strategem was rather successful; we saw the growth of separate state departments of mental health, increased funding for the hospitals, and the addition of mental illness to the agenda of important national concerns. This effort culminated in the invitation extended to Dr. Will, Dr. Jack Ewalt and myself to address the National Governors' Conference in Honolulu in 1961. We were given two hours for our presentation—two hours more than mental illness had been allotted at all previous conferences. Because of his many appearances before state legislatures, Dr. Will was particularly well received at the Honolulu conference.

Despite these rather heartening developments, psychiatry was neither a very potent nor united force in these early struggles I have depicted. There was still an elitist line of demarcation between private and public psychiatry. This polarization was most apparent in the kind of care a mental patient received; if he was quite effluent, he could seek out an analyst in one of the larger cities and pay and talk, and talk and pay, for ten years; if he came from the working class, his one and only recourse was the publicly-operated hospital. Intermediate levels of care were few and far between.

Departments of Psychiatry in the medical schools were skeletons in search of flesh. In the period immediately after World War II, the chairman was frequently a part-time teacher; the few faculty appointments were restricted to busy people with heavy private practices. In the 1950's, the momentum picked up; Departments of Psychiatry with full-time faculties burgeoned forth all across the country.

The National Institute of Mental Health was created by the Congress in 1946, but it did not begin to function as a separate entity of the Public Service until 1949. In its early years, inadequate funding severely restricted its impact upon the national scene.

It is not hard to find the bridge which began to span the gap between the era of isolation and the era of involvement. It was the report of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health. The fact that it was Congressionally-sponsored indicated, in no uncertain terms, that the plight of the mentally ill had now come into heightened national focus. Furthermore, the American Psychiatric Association, the American Medical Association, and a host of additional leading professional and lay organizations were brought together for the first time to take a cold, anthropological look at how we were handling the mentally disturbed in this country.

As the final report released in 1961 notes:

"Our proposal is the first one in American history that attempts to encompass the total problem of public support of mental health services and to make minimum standards of adequate care financially possible."

In a deeply significant way, which was to become much clearer in subsequent years, the Joint Commission report came to be regarded as a watershed document which held out the possibility of obliterating the invidious economic distinctions which had prevented millions of Americans from seeking and receiving psychiatric care. It also created the conceptual base for a liaison between entrenched psychiatric solo practice and the emerging drive toward a greater level of public responsibility for the mentally ill.

In shaping the landmark community mental health center legislation adopted by the Congress in 1963 and expanded in 1965, American psychiatry moved on to the center stage of the body politic. Many of its Orthodox shamans testified at the Congresional hearings on the legislation, and the 1965 conference on community mental health which the American Psychatric Association sponsored played a crucial role in the passage of authorizations for the staffing of the centers.

For a number of years, some of us had been trying to persuade the health insurance carriers to include adequate coverage of mental illness in their policies. Only a handful of psychiatrists joined us in this rather lonely hair shirt crusade. However, when the United Auto Workers decided in 1964 to bargain for comprehensive out-patient psychiatric coverage for all of its members, psychiatry moved dramatically and forcefully into the picture. Under the leadership of Dr. Daniel Blain, leaders in the profession worked closely with the UAW in achieving in unprecedented psychiatric benefit. The same successful pattern was repeated a few years later with the United Steelworkers of America, nailing down the proposition that the worker had the same rites of passage to good psychiatric care in the community as did his white collar counterpart blessed, or cursed, by affluence.

On the Congressional front, psychiatry became much more visible and credible. For example, it concerned itself increasingly with the budgets of the National Institute of Mental Health and sent some of its Board-certified Cardinals to Capitol Hill in support of increased monies for research, training, and the mental health centers program.

As compared to the situation just a couple of decades ago, when hospital superintendents kneeled as docile mendicants before state legislative committees and when an oppressive pall of silence and apathy hung heavily over the shadow world of mental illness, we witness today an exciting ferment of activity and personal participation characterizing the psychiatric landscape.

The community mental health center movement, with its open door policy and its store front clinics, has been a major catalyst in forcing psychiatry to probe its role in society. During the past few years, there has been a vigorous debate as to how far the psychiatrist should project himself into the buffetings and abrasions of his clients in the community. Does he take a position on poverty, racism, rent gouging by slum landlords, rigid and hostile welfare agency procedures, and the like. The psychiatrist trained twenty or thirty years ago utters the conditioned reflex caveat that such a degree of involvement dilutes the clinical effectiveness of the practitioner. The young Turks reply that you can't just treat the patient in antiseptic isolation; you must pull an oar in eviscerating the vectors which generate emotional illness and alienation.

As old certainties go by the boards, vexatious new issues create understandable anxieties in the profession. The rise of the militant consumer is a case in point. In a few of our urban mental health centers the patients, and/or their designated representatives, demand an increasing status in policy making. The eventual outcome of this struggle is not yet clear, but it is obvious that the hagiocracy of psychiatrists as Gods and dispensers of all wisdom is fading toward the grand climacteric.

As the elderly barfly observed rather wearily in Saroyan's "Time of Your Life": "There is no foundation all along the line."

As community psychiatry expands and becomes a port of entry for thousands upon thousands of patients formerly dispatched to state institutions, the ancient bastions of the mad are running out of permanent boarders. Since 1955, there has been a truly impressive 40% reduction in patients in our state mental hospitals—from a high of 558,000 in that year to only 338,000 last year. Several states are closing hospitals; this trend will accelerate in the years ahead.

The unsettling loss of formerly impregnable psychiatric real estate is the ego-shattering counterpart of a paradox with regard to the image of the psychiatrist. Largely through the stimulus of financial infusions from the National Institute of Mental Health, thousands of additional psychiatrists are trained. As a consequence, vigorous Departments of Psychiatry vie for the top banana spot in our medical schools. In some of these medical incubators, the psychiatrist has even replaced the lordly surgeon as the impossible ego model for the neophyte. Symbolic of this heightened stature is the recent birth of an American Association of Chairmen of Departments of Psychiatry.

On the other hand, new types of mental health personnel are taking over many of the functions formerly assigned to psychiatrists. In the field of community psychiatry alone, we now have community mental health workers, neighborhood aides, child-care advocates, and the career spigot is far from dry. Many of the centers are actually run by the disciples of "ancillary" professions. On this tremulous terrain, the psychiatrist finds it difficult to maintain his equilibrium.

These various happenings gestate powerful pressures for a revamping of the traditional psychiatric residency curriculum. Many of the young doctors now moving into the psychiatric pipeline express a distinct aversion to solo practice. They demand a freshly minted preceptorship with more emphasis on social psychology, group dynamics and mass behavior. The response to this concern has been languid, with only a few graduate courses in community psychiatry attempting to fill the void.

Amid all this turbulence, there is one fixed star: The surge toward reform and personal involvement already challenges at every level the comfortable patterns and protocols of yesteryear. The annual meetings of the American Psychiatric Association are no longer sedate affairs wherein old-timers socialized and a handful of brave souls honored the ritual of reading papers to largely indifferent audiences. We now have opposing slates for top positions in the APA, opinion polls of the membership, and resolutions on everything from homosexuality and the alienation of youth to the current agony in Southeast Asia.

In all fairness, the APA has come a long way. Over the past several years, it has shed its Establishment cape and wrestled with the knotty problems of delivery of health care, endemic poverty, racism, and the identity crisis of the psychiatrist as he encounters the disturbed in heart and mind or their own barren turf.

With the sweet smell of some success, comes an aroma of impatience. As psychiatry gets more and more involved, the demands of its new found constituency increase—do something about drug addiction, alcoholism, crime, sexual incompatibility and for God's sake, stop the War;

Here the moment of truth is reached. If you are in Mr. John Gardner's game of breaking up old institutions, you have to cultivate some cool and pay heed to the rigors of selectivity. As he presented it in a recent speech describing the purposes of Common Cause:

"We could take positions on scores of issues and it wouldn't necessarily help anyone or anything . . . We can take on only a few fights at a time."

In the present era of intensified involvement in mankind's many discomforts, psychiatry cannot play the Wise Elder on all

issues. Its technical competence is not all that dazzling and its practitioners, largely because of undue professional pressures, have little time to gain the necessary expertise. In "Psychiatry and Public Policy", an address to the 1965 American Psychiatric Association Convention, I put it in these terms, and I think it bears repeating:

"Psychiatry must face up to the fact that it cannot begin to meet the demands for psychological and social help from the poor, the underachieving in our schools, the frustrated among our blue collar workers, the claustrophobic residents in our crowded cities, and so on almost ad infinitum."

On the basis of a realistic assessment of what it can uniquely provide, it must pick and choose its targets. Once indifferent and unsure about the booming, buzzing world beyond its parochial pad, it must not succumb today to frenetic urgings from within and without the profession that it box the compass to prove its relevance. Much of the inflated rhetoric in the professional journals, wherein the clinicians point with alarm and the new breed points with hope, is superficial froth because psychiatry has not yet devoted the time and the sweat to the metaphysical question of what it is and where it wants to go.

In conclusion, I offer this word of consolation as the brickbats fly overhead. All of us in the mental health field can look back with a great deal of satisfaction to progress over the past quarter of a century. In that brief span of time, we have telescoped more improvements in the condition of the mentally ill than in the previous two centuries.

The age of banishment and public indifference is over. Having pierced the custodial walls and unchained the mental patients, our task in the years ahead is to shape a society in which a decent respect and compassion for all our brethern will pervade the land.

It will not be easy. Dr. Will, whose labors in the vineyard of public education were without peer in his own profession, traversed all of the rocks and hard places in one succinct observation which I have quoted endlessly and shamelessly over the years:

"Further progress in the difficult field of mental illness will come only when millions know enough, care enough and are willing to work together hard enough to make it come."

TAX RELIEF FOR HOMEOWNERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous orders of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I am introducing the Home Owners' Tax Relief Act of 1971. Joining with me in sponsoring this proposal are my distinguished colleagues: JOSEPH ADDABBO, of New York; WALTER BARING, of Nevada; MARIO BIAGGI, of New York; BEN BLACKBURN, of Georgia; FRANK BRASCO, of New York; WILLIAM BROOMFIELD, of Michigan; JAMES A. BURKE, of Massachusetts; SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, of New York; EDWARD DERWINSKI, of Illinois; JOHN DOWDY, of Texas; THADDEUS DULSKI, of New York; MENDEL DAVIS, of South Carolina; O. C. FISHER, of Texas; EDWARD GARMATZ, of Maryland; BARRY GOLDWATER, JR., of California; GEORGE GOODLING, of Pennsylvania; ELLA GRASSO, of Connecticut; SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York; ORVAL HANSEN, of Idaho; JAMES HASTINGS, of New York; WAYNE HAYS, of Ohio; LOUISE DAY HICKS, of Massachusetts; JOHN HUNT, of New Jersey; CARLETON KING, of New York; PAUL MCCLOSKEY, of California; ROMANO MAZZOLI, of Kentucky; JOHN MOSS, of California; ALVIN O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin; BERTRAM PODELL, of New York; ROBERT ROE, of New Jersey; JOHN ROUSSELOT, of California; FERNAND ST GERMAIN, of Rhode Island; and SAM STEIGER, of Arizona.

At the outset, I would like to acknowledge my debt of gratitude for the capable drafting assistance provided me by two very able practicing lawyers in the State of Florida, Michael W. Fisher of Jacksonville and H. Vernon Davids of Orlando. That I represent the 18th Congressional District of Texas rather than any Congressional District in Florida made no difference to these outstanding young men; their dedication to reforming the Federal tax framework of this Nation was not bounded by geographical considerations. Their interest lies in promoting tax justice, and for that they deserve to be commended by the Members of this House and the homeowners of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, my proposal addresses itself to the tax problems of our Nation's homeowners because I believe that they are overburdened by the combined weight of local, State, and Federal taxes. Thus, in an effort to ease their burdens, I am proposing that the Internal Revenue Code be altered in certain areas as it applies to those who own and reside in their own homes.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting at this point in the record a summary of the principal provisions of the Home Owners' Tax Relief Act of 1971. Inasmuch as my proposal is a complex and far-reaching one, I think a review of this summary will facilitate a better understanding of the act's details.

PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF THE HOME OWNERS' TAX RELIEF ACT OF 1971

SEC. 2

Enables a home owner to depreciate the investment in his home in the same manner as residential property held for rental purposes can be depreciated. A deduction limitation of $1,500 is imposed to reduce incentives for wealthy taxpayers to purchase expensive homes for tax write-off purposes.

SEC. 3

Provides that if the taxpayer elects to depreciate his home, his tax bases will be decreased accordingly. This makes a homeowner's tax status parallel with owners of residential rental property.

SEC. 4

Provides that the taxpayer who owns shares in a cooperative housing corporation will have similar depreciation tax relief as proposed for the individual home owner.

SEC. 5

Enables the taxpayer to deduct up to $1,000 for his home repairs and maintenance. This deduction is limited to exclude amounts spent for domestic servants and management of property.

SEC. 6

Enables a taxpayer to deduct as a capital loss, his economic loss on the sale of his home to the extent it does not exceed $5,000. While this section helps alleviate any economic losses suffered by an individual who must buy and sell his home within a short period of time, the $5,000 limitation minimizes potential abuses.

SEC. 8

Authorizes the taxpayer to utilize the standard deduction as well as the proposed deductions for some ownership including, within certain limits, real estate taxes and home finance interest charges. At the present time these are deductible only if the standard deduction is not taken. In operation, this section gives the home owner parallel tax status with the investor in residential rental property.

SECS. 7 AND 9

Changes present law giving taxpayers 65 or older choice of either electing non-recognition of gain under Sec. 121 or 1034, but not both. This eliminates the possibility of regressive taxation occurring in some situations where both sections are applicable. These sections also raise the non-recognition limitation for the sale of a home by persons 65 and over from $20,000 to $40,000. This increase represents a much needed adjustment to offset the effects of inflation, particularly in the building industry, that has occurred since Sec. 121 was enacted in 1964.

SEC. 10

Provides a taxpayer 65 or older with a $1,000 deduction if he has a life interest in a retirement home which represents an investment of at least $5,000. Under present regulations a life interest in a retirement home does not constitute a "principal residence" as defined in Section 1034 and used in this Act. This section is included because an elderly taxpayer who avails himself of the facilities of a retirement community should not be denied tax relief merely because he does not hold legal title to his residence.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, the Home Owners' Tax Relief Act of 1971 has much to recommend it. Individual homeownership is of singular importance to this society as we know it, for those who own their own homes tend to have a greater interest in local affairs and community life than do renters and transients. Thus, in a public policy sense, structuring Federal tax policy to favor homeownership is quite consistent with the public interest.

When speaking of the concept of homeownership, it must never be forgotten that individual homeownership represents an unparalleled opportunity for the average American to make a substantial investment for the future. In purchasing a home, an individual takes part of the income he allocates for living expenses and invests it in his residence. Moreover, as financial security is a goal for which most Americans direct much of their energy, and since the problems of financial security beset such a significant portion of the Nation's elderly, creating a new Federal tax policy, one that encourages an individual to invest in a home, is a highly desirable goal of legislative action.

Despite the positive aspects of homeownership, I would point out that as a practical matter homeownership is becoming less attractive to individuals and to families. For one thing, the rate of local and State taxation has soared in recent years, and homeowners are bearing what in many States is a disproportionate share of the increases. For another thing, living patterns and life styles of the American family have changed quite dramatically in recent years; according to recent statistics, the average family moves once every 3 years. This cannot help to adversely affect the attitudes of potential home buyers, particularly when one considers the eco-

nomic fact that if a person purchases a home that he is forced by circumstances to sell after a year or two, it is more probable than not that the homeowner will lose money on the deal. Thus legislating a new Federal tax policy that would ease the tax burdens of homeowners and would diminish the negative aspects of homeownership for mobile individuals and families would also be a desirable public policy goal.

Finally, it is a matter of dismal fact that the economy is not functioning as fully as it is capable of doing. Enacting this act would provide new strength to the economy because to the extent individuals see owning a home as an advantage rather than a detriment and focus their purchasing power accordingly, to that extent the home construction, repair, and maintenance industries will be strengthened. And when one takes stock of the fact that the home construction, repair, and maintenance industries traffic in such goods and services as lumber, concrete, plaster, paint, tile, plumbing, heating, electrical, steel, and other related items, the multiplier effect and the economic impact of an upswing in home purchases becomes obvious.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, the Home Owners' Tax Relief Act of 1971 promotes fairness in Federal tax policy, is consistent with American traditions of private property ownership, and is an economic booster. Any tax revenue losses occasioned by the act, losses which could potentially exceed $5 billion, would be partially offset by the new revenues accruing from the expected increases in the home construction, maintenance, and repair industries.

I urge my colleagues to give this proposal their careful attention and their full support. In my judgment, the interests of tax justice and the needs of our Nation's homeowners demand nothing less.

STILL NO PROGRESS ON THE PRISONER-OF-WAR QUESTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on December 7, 1970, almost 6 months ago today, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of the 1,531 Americans missing in action in Vietnam. In the intervening period the United States has continued to withdraw troops from Vietnam, and the scope of the war has lessened substantially to the point where frequently more Americans are killed by accidents irrelated to combat there than by hostile action.

However, there is still no progress on the prisoner-of-war question. Although President Nixon has brought home over 75,000 soldiers in the last 6 months, the enemy has not sent home one of our men they hold prisoner.

Today, it is my sad duty to update the list of missing in action and add the names of 50 additional men who may now be held prisoner by the North Vietnamese, Vietcong, and the Pathet Lao. Regrettably, during the last 6 months, it has been learned that 20 of those previously listed as missing have now been confirmed as killed in action. Their names also follow my remarks today, and they will be listed in the next Vietnam Roll of Honor which I shall place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within the next several weeks.

It has now been 7 years and 76 days since the first American was captured by the enemy. During all of that time, Hanoi has absolutely refused to honor the Geneva Convention on Prisoners-of-War, as have the Vietcong and the Pathet Lao. No inspection of prison camps is permitted, sick and wounded are not repatriated, and little mail gets through.

Thus, for each name listed below, anguish and uncertainty begins for the family and friends. Whether he is sick or well, whether he is in prison or lost in a steaming jungle, even whether he is dead or alive—each of these questions daily haunts the lives of his loved ones.

President Nixon has made an irreversible decision to bring U.S. troops out of Vietnam. The only question remaining is the timing of the withdrawal. His primary consideration as he brings men home from Vietnam is the safety of those who remain behind, especially those who are held captive by the enemy. The President has stated that so long as one American remains in enemy hands, he will not order all American troops to return from Southeast Asia. In this decision, he undoubtedly has the support of the American people.

I believe that the other side has misjudged the effect of their attempts to make American prisoners of war political pawns in the war for public opinion. Instead of building U.S. domestic sentiment for immediate withdrawal, Hanoi's policy serves to maintain American public sentiment in support of the war. In my view, more humane policies would hasten U.S. withdrawal, not prolong it. In fact, President Nixon has publicly stated just that.

Earlier this year, I personally delivered to the North Vietnamese Embassy in Paris a letter stating how I thought the POW issue was prolonging the war in Vietnam. I have withheld the content of the message until now hoping Hanoi would respond.

Regretfully, the Communist representatives at the Paris peace talks have not seen fit to respond, and indeed, I cannot be sure my message was even read.

My efforts to secure personal interviews with them during my stay in Paris were fruitless. Prior to leaving Washington, I sent a telegram to North Vietnamese delegate Xuan Thuy which stated:

Would like to visit you in Paris February 22 or morning February 23 to discuss certain aspects of war in Southeast Asia. Hope you can meet with me.

I received no response prior to my departure; however, upon my return to Washington I found the following telegram at my office:

Sorry cannot dispose time meet with you concerning POW issue. Please ask Mr. Nixon—DRV Delegation.

The North Vietnamese must have deduced that I wanted to talk about American prisoners held captive since I did not mention it in my wire.

Nevertheless, once in Paris I made several efforts to see the North Vietnamese delegation. An interview appointment was suggested by them only after the Hanoi embassy had first determined that I would have returned to the United States prior to the suggested date. I learned that this was a tactic often used by them to avoid meeting with Americans.

The best I could do was to go alone to the North Vietnamese Embassy in Paris, rap on the door and hand my letter through a small heavily barred opening in the main door.

In my view, this was most unfortunate for all parties to the conflict, because the argument I wished to advance was one which, to my knowledge, had not previously been presented to them.

Hanoi seems to be laboring under the misapprehension that their crude, unjust policies toward POW's work to their advantage, building resentment in the United States against further involvement in the war. Actually, it is working just the opposite. It is the one issue on which almost all Americans unite; we cannot complete our withdrawal from Vietnam until the safe return of all prisoners is assured.

Here is the text of my appeal to Xuan Thuy:

Minister XUAN THUY,
Chief of Delegation of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Avenue General Leclerc, Choisy-Le-Roi, Paris, France.

DEAR MINISTER THUY: Regardless of their varied opinions on the war in Southeast Asia, virtually all Americans are agreed upon one thing—United States military personnel held captive in Southeast Asia are not proper subjects in the political bargaining for a settlement of the war. Evidence of this fact is abundant. While no one would argue that over 80 per cent of Americans agree on anything, including the conduct of the Vietnam war, a survey after the raid of Sontay of next-of-kin of prisoners-of-war showed that fully 81 per cent approved of the attempt, while only 10 per cent disapproved.

Nothing has so served to maintain American public sentiment in support of the war as the lack of progress on the prisoner-of-war issue. There is a growing, gnawing doubt and pessimism on the part of most Americans, a doubt which serves only to harden public attitude toward those who are daily accused of violating international law and of mistreating prisoners-of-war. This growing doubt is the single most important factor which tends to build support in my country for a hard-line policy in Vietnam.

Difficult as it is for Americans to contemplate anything but total victory in any military effort of which they are a part, it is utterly impossible for them to consider abandoning their military men to the vicissitudes and uncertainties of a drawn-out settlement—military or political. Never before, not during either of the World Wars nor during the Korean conflict, have prisoners been exchanged on any basis other than for their opposite numbers held captive. To inject a political element into what for Americans is an emotional, moral and compassionate subject is to infuse the Southeast Asian war with a surrealism which works against any settlement—not in favor of one.

With all respect, I would like to suggest the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the representatives of the National Liberation Front consider adoption of a policy of flexi-

bility on the prisoner-of-war issue and attempt to determine what the reaction of world opinion might be to such a policy.

One very limited step which I would like to suggest for your consideration is the following: North Vietnam has submitted a list of those missing Americans who are no longer alive. It would be an act of great human compassion if your government would provide to the families of these dead men information of a strictly personal nature. It would mean a great deal to them if you could provide them with any personal belongings of their loved ones, information about their remains, and possibly the location of their burial. Surely such information can have no military or political significance to your government. Yet to these loved ones, many of whom still cling to the agonizing hope that their soldier is yet alive, this step would be an act of mercy which would permit them to begin rebuilding their lives.

A second small step which you might consider would involve providing more specific information on the status of certain men whose fate is presently uncertain. For example, some photographs of prisoners have been released by your government from which identification is impossible. While the number is not large, the immense agony caused to families of missing men is best illustrated by a recent occurrence. Recently your government released a film clip containing the pictures of over 60 prisoners-of-war. It has not been possible positively to identify at least 20 of the Americans pictured, yet 800 separate American families have "identified" one of the 20 photographs as being of their loved one. Your assistance in helping to identify these men would be an act of humanity which all the world would applaud.

In other cases, we know, and your government has confirmed, a pilot has gone down over North Vietnamese territory, and his fate has been established. Left unclear has been the status of the co-pilot of the same aircraft. The uncertainty caused the family of the co-pilot is only heightened by the fact that the pilot has been found and is classified as either captured or dead.

In cases such as the above, I would gladly cooperate in providing photographs of identified prisoners, or the names of missing co-pilots, in order to facilitate identification.

I would hope that this second small step might be considered by your government, and I am sure that the rewards at the bar of world opinion would be substantial.

From your own point of view, such an initiative would also enable you to judge the relative desirability of adopting a position of flexibility on the prisoner-of-war issue. I would hope that such a policy would be possible, and that further initiatives could follow leading to an eventual exchange of all prisoners held by both sides.

Thank you for giving this matter your serious consideration.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Member of Congress.

Unfortunately, there has still been no response to my letter, although the fate of hundreds of Americans hangs in the balance. Each of these men truly ranks with the other heroes of our history. Each has been called upon to sacrifice mightily for his country. Each deserves every recognition and honor we can bestow upon him. And each must have our prayers.

List of those classified missing in action from September 19, 1970, to May 15, 1971:

David Franklin Allwine, James Henry Ayres, Charles Albert Beals, Jack Meyring Butcher, Joseph Lyons Chestnut, Donald Martin Cramer, Barton Sheldon Creed, David Arthur Davidson, Dennis Irvin Day, Richard Clair Dority, Thomas Allen Duckett.

Fred Allen Gassman, David Landrell Ginn, Norbert Anthony Gotner, Jame Arthur Harwood, Luis Gallegos Holguin, Charles Lee Hoskins, Lewis Howard, Jr., Clive Garth Jeffs, Larry Gene Kier, Perry Castellion Kitchens.

Jeffrey Charles Lemon, Carroll Baxter Lilly, Harold Benton Lineberger, Patrick Joseph Magee, Arlie Robert Mangus, Jerry Dean Martin, Wyatt Miller, Jr., Calvin Andrew Norris, Thomas Richard Okerlund, Stanley Edward Olmstead, Dennis William Omelia.

William August Ott, Carl Anthony Palen, James Robert Pantall, Michael Duane Parsons, Ralph Nathan Pattillo, Bernard H. Plassmeyer, Ferris Ansel Rhodes, Jr., Ronald James Schultz, Donald Emerson Shay, Jr.

John Daniel Shewmake, Sr., Walter Harris Sigafoos, Jr., Owen George Skinner, James L. Smith, Robert L. Standerwick, Sr., Douglas Frank Strait, Charles Wayne Stratton, John Curtis Stringer II, Peter Joe Wilson, David Walter Woods.

List of those previously classified as missing which have, since September, 1970, been reported as dead:

Clyde Douglas Alloway, Mark Albert Babson, Jr., James Albert Bailey, James Douglas Birchim, Victor Patrick Buckley, Clyde William Campbell, Carl Russell Churchill, Raphael Lorenzo Collazo, Lawrence Yerges Conway, John Alanson Dixon.

Dallas Alan Driver, Jimmy Ray Garbett, Michael Lee Klingner, Raymond Gregory Moore, Charles C. Pfordt, Jr., Lynn Kesler Powell, James Terry Savage, James Lawrence Suydam, James Henry Turner.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

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

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

Edwin Austin Abbey was one of America's foremost illustrators and mural printers.

Studied at Pennsylvania Academy, joined staff of illustrators, Harper's Weekly, 1871, resigning in 1874 to freelance. Concentrating on faithful recreation of 17th and 18th century modes and manners in pen and water color, he developed a charming, original style. Commissioned to sketch in England in 1878, he remained there save for brief visits to America. His best work is found in selections from the poetry of Robert Herrick, 1882, Goldsmith's "She Stoops to Conquer," 1886; "Old Songs" 1889, as muralist, he won fame for designs in the Boston public library and the Pennsylvania State Capitol.

THE NATION DISCUSSES KANSAS ATOMIC WASTE PLANT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order to the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SKUBITZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the June 7 issue of the Nation features an in-depth article on the proposed Kansas atomic waste dump. Entitled "The AEC Has Something for Kansas," the piece was written by Randy Brown, investigative and special assignments reporter for the Wichita Eagle, a major Kansas daily newspaper.

Mr. Brown has compressed into a relatively brief and eminently readable article a tremendous amount of factual material about the background and current status of the Atomic Energy Commission's endeavor to find a place to bury vast amounts of rapidly accumulating deadly atomic-waste materials. The article is a first-class piece of well-balanced journalism and reflects credit on Mr. Brown, and particularly upon the Nation, for bringing such information to its educated and informed readers.

In my judgment, my colleagues in the Congress will find the article interesting and informative, bringing into perspective the conflict between the welfare of a citizenry and their land, on one hand, and, on the other, the power of a Government agency under pressure to deal with a Frankenstein that grew out of its zeal to spread the peaceful uses of the atom. I ask, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the text of the Nation's article be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

NUCLEAR GARBAGE DUMP—THE AEC HAS SOMETHING FOR KANSAS

(By Randy Brown)

WICHITA.—The United States Atomic Energy Commission both promotes and regulates the use of commercial nuclear energy, which is akin to putting General Motors in charge of automobile safety standards. In the words of one Kansas Sierra Club official, "it's a helluva way to run a railroad."

Right now, despite myriad protests and unanswered questions, the commission is chargin ahead with plans to run its railroad—composed of heavily shielded freight cars (as yet unbuilt and undesigned) loaded with commercial atomic waste material—right into the heart of Kansas. The nuclear debris (some of it "high-level," or extremely radioactive) is to be buried 1,000 feet underground, in an abandoned salt mine at the edge of the town of Lyons. There, the AEC is trying to convince everyone, it will repose peacefully until it breaks down to a "safe" level at various dates, stretching, for the most persistent particles, almost 500,000 years into the future. Unless something happens to divert this plan, Kansas will become, starting about 1975, the nation's commercial graveyard, and the AEC's trains will descend on the state from reactor sites all across the United States.

Apart from those provided by the AEC, there are no federal guidelines for the proper disposal of atomic waste, which will pour out of commercial generators at a geometrically increasing rate for the remainder of the 20th century. Nor has Congress provided legal remedy for those who wish to prevent their state or community from becoming an atomic garbage dump. The AEC itself is without established criteria for public participation in decisions concerning the disposal of nuclear waste. All this leaves Kansas with a near-total dependence upon the noblesse oblige of the AEC, and therefore the commission has demonstrated a lot of noblesse and very little oblige.

Since June 1970, when the commission announced that Kansas had been "awarded" a "National Nuclear Park," the AEC has been assuring everyone that the safety and integrity of the project, which eventually will cost U.S. taxpayers $25 million, was virtually

beyond question, that all proper studies had been made, that Lyons was the best possible site for nuclear waste disposal, that Kansas would be doing a vital service for the rest of the nation, and that any bugs in the plan could be engineered out as the project proceeded.

But also since the announcement, a growing body of independent scientific and political opinion has cast varying degrees of doubt on almost every AEC contention and has added a number of questions and considerations to the discussion. From early this year, some critics have been calling for suspension of the project, until further studies can prove beyond doubt the safety of the site and the suitability of AEC methods. The AEC, while admitting that it has not conducted at least two safety studies considered vital by independent scientists, and reluctantly agreeing to conduct them, is agreeing to no such moratorium and continues to ask urgently for $3.5 million for the purchase of land and to complete designs for storage. Why the AEC wants to buy a site that may yet prove unsafe and unsuitable is an open question, but one good guess can be made by combining statements from project critics—one from the staff of Rep. Joe Skubitz (R., Kan.), and another from Dr. William Hambleton, director of the Kansas Geological Survey. A Skubitz aide says, "AEC is in a bind. . . . They've got to get rid of [a great deal of already accumulated waste] and the salt mine at Lyons is the only place they've studied." Hambleton adds, "The power tactics of the AEC do not fill us with confidence. . . . One wonders whether the AEC can ever be stopped once it gains momentum."

If the AEC is indeed in a bind, and it gives every indication of being so (Milton Shaw, director of reactor development for the commission, has been quoted as saying, presumably only half in jest: "We're not in a panic situation. If this doesn't go, we'll throw up our hands and probably cut our throats"), it is really no wonder; the problem of nuclear waste is accelerating. By the end of 1971, twenty-nine nuclear power plants will be operating in the United States; by the year 2000, the AEC estimates, there will be nearly 1,000, producing 3,000 metric tons of waste to be buried at Lyons annually. Already, the AEC is holding 80 million gallons of both commercial and military high-level liquid waste in temporary "repositories" near Idaho Falls, Ida., Richland, Wash., and Aiken, S.C. Sen. Frank Church (D., Ida.), has demanded that the Idaho Falls wastes be removed because of the possibility that the storage area, which is directly above the Snake River aquifer, will pollute that water supply. There also has been a hassle in the state of Washington.

The AEC has been eyeing Kansas as the solution to its commercial waste problems for almost fifteen years, although it still hasn't decided what to do with military waste. In 1961, an initial foray into the state came to grief when the late U.S. Sen. Andrew Schoeppel brought the rest of the Kansas Congressional delegation into his fold and effectively blocked the project. Information gathered by the Kansas Sierra Club indicates that the AEC, now trying for a second time to enter the state, sought to evade a repetition of the political problem by issuing a memorandum to the effect that AEC employees were to keep quiet about Lyons.

At any rate, the commission, under the guise of demonstrating a method for disposing of radioactive wastes in salt, has been around the Lyons area since 1965. The AEC's plans are relatively simple. After the waste reaches Kansas by rail, it will be lowered into the mine, which will have been enlarged with a series of tunnels and chambers. The atomic debris, shielded with steel, will be buried in pits carved into the chambers, after which the chambers will be back-filled with crushed salt. The AEC wants to purchase 200 acres of surface land and acquire subsurface rights to another 1,000 acres, thus acquiring a 1-square-mile underground vault with a capacity of 1.28 million cubic feet of waste, 280,000 cubic feet of which will be the high-level variety. The AEC concedes that, within three years of burial, the steel containers will disintegrate from the tremendous internal heat of the debris and the eroding action of the salt, but it insists that the salt will permanently seal off the radioactive particles from the environment.

One Kansas geologist is said to be convinced that salt "is not the stuff" in which to bury atomic wastes; he is therefore very anxious that the AEC carry out additional testing before it goes further with site acquisition and design. That view is in the minority; most scientists, both inside Kansas and out, feel that, under ideal conditions, salt may be the safest medium to use because of its relative inertia and high melting point. But whether the safety of salt has been proved by actual test and whether the Lyons mine satisfies the necessary "ideal" conditions are subjects still open to serious question.

Hambleton, who has worked with the AEC and its independent contractors in studies for the project and who is considered Kansas's most informed scientist on the geological conditions in the area, has well-substantiated reservations. He asserts that the AEC has not made sufficient studies of the heat flow problem associated with radioactive material, nor properly examined the effect radiation will have on the structure of the salt. Problems with heat flow and radiation damage to salt are not likely, but the results would be so catastrophic, if they did occur, that the possibilities must be studied.

Once freed from the containers, and under the right set of circumstances, the radioactive material could conceivably generate temperatures up to 800 degrees centigrade in the mine, causing salt in and around the mine to flow, Hambleton contends. The AEC has estimated that temperatures could not go above 350 degrees centigrade, but such an assumption is based on an "oversimplification," he charges.

The commission based its conclusions on a half-salt, half-shale composition of the area; actually, the subsurface strata consist of alternating beds of salt and shale. Since heat flow is greater in sites of alternate layers, temperatures in the mine could reach 800 degrees. At that point, Hambleton said, the salt would flow and consolidate to a much greater degree than the AEC expects. As a result, overlying rocks could shift and sink, producing fractures through which surface and ground waters could reach the salt. The salt would then dissolve and expose the radioactive wastes to the Kansas environment.

In a report to the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Hambleton expressed a further concern: the large amounts of energy stored in the salt could be released by structural changes caused by radiation, and that could set off a series of underground explosions and cause a heat chain reaction, raising temperatures far above the original AEC estimate and resulting in the destruction of the storage area and the exposure of the wastes.

Waste retrieval, in the event something goes wrong, and transportation of the radioactive material over long distances are two other problems the AEC hopes to "engineer out" as the disposal scheme proceeds. Says Hambelton: "We judge that plans for safe transportation of these radioactive materials are completely inadequate and that no contingency plans for retrieval of waste exists at all."

AEC says it will carefully chart the location of all containers and that waste material will not move from the area in which it is buried even when the canisters disintegrate. Hambleton demurs, saying the wastes will indeed migrate because of salt flow and the natural movement of radioactive particles. The AEC admits that it has only "postulated" a retrieval method, but says it would go in with a full-scale mining operation if that should prove necessary.

Although some of AEC's own people have raised doubts about the safety of moving high-level radioactive waste halfway across the country, AEC points to its transportation record and says it will design freight cars to haul the waste without mishap. Cylinders containing the material are to be imbedded in 100-ton ceramic blocks, a proposal that causes critics of the project to wonder whether Kansas railroad beds are strong enough to support such weight.

All the project's problems are compounded by the extreme radioactivity and longevity of the high-level waste. One of the cylinders, for example, contains material emitting 10 billion rads of radioactivity, enough to kill everyone in the United States. Three really troublesome isotopes would be buried in Kansas: strontium-90, cesium-137 and plutonium. Sesium-137 emits gamma radiation, which can easily penetrate thick shields, and, like stronium-90, will remain dangerous in human terms for about 600 years. Plutonium, which is dangerous only if actually ingested into the body, will be lethal for half a million years.

Obviously, safety standards for such a project can tolerate no possibility of mistakes. The AEC has a fine safety record, with no loss of life or serious injury, but the record is hardly perfect. There have been fifteen known cases of liquid-waste tank failure, eleven in Washington and four in South Carolina.

Hambleton's criticisms are perhaps the most impressive because of his expert knowledge about Kansas and the Lyons area, but he is hardly alone. Gov. Robert Docking has belatedly joined the general call for a delay. (In late 1970 he had said: "There is nothing Kansas can do now to stop the Atomic Energy Commission from placing a nuclear waste repository at Lyons.") The U.S. Department of the Interior has declined to endorse the project until further studies are made. Forty-six state Representatives and eight state Senators co-sponsored a resolution backing the moratorium. And on May 8, a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency report, released by the entire Kansas Congressional delegation, strongly backed project critics. EPA pointed out the need for "further review of the environmental and safety implications of the project," and added that the AEC should give more consideration to the long-term ability of salt to hold wastes and prevent them from contaminating the environment. The EPA report also emphasized that plans should be developed for recovery of the wastes. On May 22 the EPA returned to the subject, saying "it is not possible for us to assess fully the environmental impact" on the basis of information supplied by the AEC.

More critics enter the fray when the specific questions—why Lyons? why Kansas?—are raised. The AEC says it chose Lyons because it is located in the largest area of salt deposits in the country; it has the lowest population density of all sites considered; it is located in an area of low seismic activity.

The "population density" argument is particularly fascinating. If population is of any concern, one has grounds to question the safety of the AEC's plans. In fact, Representative Skubitz says, the AEC has indicated to him that it hesitates to dump the wastes near Detroit because of the high population there, and, presumably, the possibility of an accident. A site near Hanover, Wash., was termed perfectly safe by an AEC official in 1965; apparently it is no longer considered so. Skubitz points out that extensive salt

beds exist all through Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania and New York; all these areas are much closer to the vast majority of the reactors which create the wastes.

From the perspective of geological history, the Lyons area is indeed stable, but whether it is significantly more stable than the East Coast is another moot point, for Kansas is certainly not free of seismic disturbances. The Department of the Interior states that "since earthquakes have occurred at many times in the Kansas-Nebraska region, they can be expected to occur in the future." Skubitz comments: "We experienced an earthquake in Kansas less than 100 miles from the Lyons site as late as 1968."

But it is the implication that Kansas has been "awarded" the project and that the state will be performing a vital service by accepting it that really galls Skubitz and many other Kansans. "Most misleading of all," says Skubitz, "is the suggestion that if Kansas agrees to become the nation's atomic dump by permitting the construction of a tax-exempt federal facility, it would be doing the nation a 'vital' service. The fact is that Kansas would be performing a 'vital' service only for privately owned nuclear power plants of such companies as Consolidated Edison of New York, Detroit Edison of Michigan and Commonwealth Edison of Illinois. There are no nuclear power plants in Kansas today."

The suspicion is growing that, since opposition in Idaho and Washington has already stalled AEC disposal plans for those states, Kansas is the AEC's last hope. Rather than having been "awarded" anything, a lot of people feel that the state will have "lost" in competition with its forty-nine brothers.

Though it finally agreed in March to conduct the heat flow and salt radiation studies so passionately requested the AEC has handled the clamor in a style Hambleton calls "lateral arabesque. . . . Each time the AEC is faced with a decisive question, the question is delicately sidestepped. . . . The AEC will yield just as much as it has to in order to gain its objectives and will attempt to override all opposition with the sheer weight of its total resources. . . . In our contacts with the scientists and engineers at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, we have been impressed with their forthrightness, candor and technical competence. However, whenever our questions were referred to a higher echelon in the AEC, we were met with silence, delay or evasion. . . . We have had cause to question . . . the credibility of the AEC."

At first, Hambleton was willing to let the AEC proceed with site acquisition, since he assumed that, being a reasonable scientist asking reasonable questions, his concerns would be shared. But questions from the state geological survey have been greeted with "arrogance," he said, and the AEC treated the survey's initial concerns "as of little consequence." Now Hambleton wants to block the portion of the proposed appropriation that would go for land purchase.

Skubitz has spent the better part of a year trying to get some straight answers—with little success. In a letter to AEC Chairman Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, he accused the AEC of "bureaucratic doubletalk, the Orwellian jargon that war is peace," and added: "It is obvious why the AEC has become increasingly suspect and why Kansas citizens must become increasingly wary of AEC machinations." Skubitz is fond of saying that "the AEC is trying to play God" and that commission bureaucrats feel Kansans are "country bumpkins."

Governor Docking also is piqued. "I do not want this repository in Kansas until a majority of Kansas scientists and citizens are satisfied it will be safe. At this time, I am not satisfied it will be safe—and neither are a majority of Kansas citizens and scientists. . . . I resent the high-handedness of some AEC officials in the 'steamroller' approach to moving ahead with plans for the repository at Lyons."

Lyons, a farm city of about 5,000 persons located in the center of the state, is officially prepared to place absolute trust in the AEC. The commission has told the city fathers that the project will bring new jobs and new industry into Lyons. But aside from the 200 persons who will be required to run the disposal plant once it gets into high gear about 1980, one wonders what there is about several thousand tons of high-level atomic waste material, lying 1,000 feet underground at the end of a dusty lane called 5th Street, that will attract new industry. A study aided by the Boeing Company has produced no answer to this question. However, the Mayor, the leading banker and the Lyons *Daily News* stand solidly behind the AEC, and the criticism that is building undoubtedly galls them. One Lyons citizen said he was told by a member of the Chamber of Commerce not to attend a forum on the project in Wichita. The large capacity for trust displayed by the citizens of Lyons is said to be inspired by the sure and certain knowledge that the federal government wouldn't put something in their town that wasn't safe, practical or necessary to the American way of life. Residents are quoted in the state and national press as saying they know the AEC is O.K. because they went to church with AEC scientists for several years, the atomic energy "is something that kept me from having to storm the beaches of Japan"; that Lyons "just couldn't get a cleaner industry," and that "it's about the grandest thing that could happen to a place." Mayor Robert Briscoe sums it up: "It all boils down to who you put your faith in. . . . We put ours in AEC."

But you don't have to spend much time in Lyons to discover that the local citizens are neither "country bumpkins" about the project nor owned by the Chamber of Commerce, and that their placid acquiescence has been considerably overplayed. A teen-age girl says that the AEC should conduct more studies and that the project scares her. A middle-aged service station operator believes most people in the area really are opposed. An elderly woman comments that she's for it, but that public ardor has cooled considerably of late, probably as a response to the statewide cry for more studies, and more investigation. One of the most vexing problems posed by the "Lyons Nuclear Park" is the long-term nature of the danger; the response of some Lyons middle-aged folk is curious: "Well, we won't be around if anything goes wrong, anyway."

Some Kansans now are preparing efforts designed to insure that nothing goes wrong at any time. Skubitz already has testified before the House Public Works Committee, which held hearings during May on the $3.5 million appropriation for land purchase and project design. The House Appropriations Committee should report to the floor of the House some time in July on the request. The AEC meanwhile has asked the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to increase the commission budget by $1 million for the additional safety studies. One project critic calls the AEC's safety studies' request a "sop" to speed approval of the $3.5 million.

If the AEC does obtain its money, the Kansas Sierra Club is planning to file an injunction halting the project. Ron Baxter, club chairman, feels such an injunction could be obtained "easily," and the club wants it to stick until AEC comes up with an environmental statement that meets the approval of the President's Environmental Council and until additional studies are reviewed and O.K.d by *independent* scientific sources. And Governor Docking has already asked the Kansas Attorney General to prepare some kind of injunctive relief to enforce the moratorium.

Even though salt flow and radiation studies are still incomplete (if done properly, they may require one to two years), the AEC remains adamant. Dr. Seaborg is full of assurances that no atomic waste will be put into the Lyons salt mine until all safety questions are answered, but the AEC continues to insist that money for the land purchase and project design be appropriated (and the project, thus, in effect begun) so that "safety studies are not delayed."

Kansans, into whose backyard will be placed commercial nuclear wastes ten to thirty times as radioactive as military wastes now being produced, are not convinced that the project must get started before all possible precautions are taken. On the other hand, there is little or no "scare" opposition to the mere concept of such a project in Kansas. Kansans want to believe that all is well; they are not worried by the "mushroom cloud" myth; if AEC plans are proved safe and sane, most reluctance will disappear.

Although the AEC seems to be opening up a little in response to criticism being heaped on it, answers and solutions have not been the commission's primary consideration. It admits that it sees the disposal of nuclear waste as secondary to the development of commercial nuclear power. Sen. Frank Church has calculated that the commission has spent billions on the development of atomic energy in the last twenty-five years and only $50 million in research on waste disposal. Now the AEC has promised to stop the Lyons project if it determins that the plans are unsafe. Will it? What if an independent scientific review disputes AEC's findings or draws from them conclusions different from those of the commission? Will the AEC then halt the project? Can the AEC, or any government agency, be an effective watchdog over its own conduct? Kansas is not reassured.

PANAMA CANAL MODERNIZATION: COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S COMMENTS PLACE RESPONSIBILITY ON THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the vital question of providing increased transit facilities across the American Isthmus has been before the Congress periodically since 1939. Cognizant committees in both House and Senate now have under consideration identical measures to provide for the major modernization of the Panama Canal: S. 734, introduced by Senator STROM THURMOND; and H.R. 712, introduced by me. These bills would authorize the resumption of construction on the suspended 1939 Third Locks project for the existing Panama Canal as modified and operationally improved as a result of experience during World War II. Work on this project, it should be noted, was deferred in May 1942 because of more urgent war needs for personnel, materials, and shipping.

A total of more than $171,000,000 has been expended toward the major modernization of the Panama Canal as follows: $95,000,000 on the enlargement of Gaillard Cut and other channel improvements completed on August 15, 1970; and $76,357,405 on the Third Locks project, chiefly on lock site excavations near Gatun and Miraflores for a set of additional larger locks for larger vessels. These two lock site excavations were substantially completed and can be utilized

for the major increase of capacity and operational improvement of the existing Panama Canal with every assurance of success. The modernization plan provided in the bills is the operationally based, time tested and strongly supported Terminal Lake-Third Locks proposal developed in the Panama Canal organization during World War II and approved by President Franklin D. Roosevelt as a postwar project.

In line with normal legislative procedure the above-mentioned bills were referred to various agencies of Government for comment. So far I have received a copy of the comments by the Comptroller General of the United States, which correctly places the responsibility in the premises squarely where it belongs—on the Congress.

Because the Comptroller General's letter failed to present essential facts that cannot be ignored, I discussed it at considerable length in a reply to the chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and distributed copies of both letters to all Members of the Congress.

As the contents of the indicated letters should be of interest to responsible agencies in the executive branch of our Government and users of the Panama Canal, I shall quote them as parts of my remarks along with the full text of H.R. 712 to which they refer and commend them for consideration by the Congress, its jurisdictional committees, and others who may have related responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, here I would emphasize that after many years of study of the canal problem, including numerous consultations with various experienced independent canal and defense experts, I consider that the plan contemplated in the indicated bills offers the best solution of the interoceanic canal problem when it is evaluated from all angles—the Terminal Lake-Third Locks proposal. Not only does this plan enable the maximum utilization of all work so far accomplished on the Panama Canal it is also best from every significant point of view—operational, maintenance, economic, diplomatic, and ecological. Accordingly, I urge prompt hearings on the indicated bills.

For those seeking additional background information, attention is invited to my addresses in the present Congress as follows:

"Panama Sea Level Project: Danger of Poisonous Pacific Sea Snakes Infesting the Atlantic," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 21, 1971: "Panama Canal Basic Issues: Sovereignty and Modernization," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 5, 1971; and "Transcendent Panama Canal Issue: U.S. Sovereignty or U.S.S.R. Control," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 3, 1971. In addition, a volume of my addresses on "Isthmian Canal Policy Questions" published as House Document No. 474, 89th Congress, contains much authentic information.

A reading of the above-listed addresses and volume will emphasize that the Panama Canal is not a matter with which to trifle but a major policy question that can be wisely resolved only through a reasoned line of thought and the realities involved. The great Isthmian challenges are: First, the maintenance of undiluted U.S. sovereignty over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone territory, and, second, the major modernization of the existing Panama Canal under current treaty provisions. All other canal questions, however important, are irrelevant and should not be allowed to confuse the two great issues.

In these general connections, it should not be overlooked that the establishment in 1959 of Soviet power in Cuba was the first major step for a final takeover of the Panama Canal. Since the Cuban missile crisis of 1962 the growth of Soviet naval power has been astounding. For the first time in its history, the U.S.S.R. is currently using its deployed naval strength in areas not contiguous to the Soviet Union. Its war vessels are now operating on a sustained basis in the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean, and periodically in the Caribbean and Gulf of Mexico. It is in Soviet interest to open the Suez Canal and to gain control over the Panama Canal, as such events would have the same effect as greatly increasing the number of vessels in Soviet fleets that are now prowling in strategic waters of the world. Until the Soviet challenge is removed it is in Western interest to keep the Suez Canal closed. Under any conditions, it is imperative that the United States retain its complete sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal.

The present pro-Communist-infiltrated revolutionary Government of Panama, trying to keep itself in power and aiming to drive the United States from the isthmus, is making unwarranted and unrealistic demands for the surrender by the United States of the Canal Zone, the installations therein, and the canal itself. This would inevitably lead to a complete Communist takeover of the Panama Canal as well as of Panama and endanger the security of the entire Western Hemisphere. Such a tragic eventuality would be wholly precluded by the enactment of the pending legislation to which reference has been made.

The indicated letters and bill follow:

May 26, 1971.

Hon. EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The May 4, 1971, letter of the Comptroller General of the United States comments on H.R. 712, 92nd Congress, a bill that would authorize the major increase of capacity and operational improvement of the existing Panama Canal, which is identical with S. 734 introduced by Senator Strom Thurmond. These measures provide for the elimination of the bottleneck locks at Pedro Miguel, raising the present summit lake water level (82'–87') to its optimum height (about 92'), construction of an additional channel of larger locks, consolidation of all Pacific Locks south of Miraflores near Aguadulce, and creation of a summit level terminal lake at the Pacific end of the canal, thus making the Pacific lock site layout correspond to that at Gatun on the Atlantic side.

The Comptroller General's letter correctly summarizes decisive elements in the recommendations of the December 1, 1970, report of the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission under Public Law 88–609 headed by Robert B. Anderson as follows:

(a) That the "existing" Panama Canal be "modernized" to provide its "maximum potential capacity"; but

(b) That "no additional locks" be constructed.

The recommendation in the cited Anderson report for "modernizing" the existing canal is definitely misleading as it consists only of routine programs of repairs and minor alterations for the *existing* canal and its structures as may be required for efficient maintenance and operation. The recommended "modernizing" would not be the long-needed major canal modernization but merely treatments of individual symptoms; and after their completion the canal would still be essentially what it was in 1914!

The recommendation in the 1970 report "that no additional locks should be constructed" conforms to the 1944 warning by former Governor Glen E. Edgerton of the Panama Canal to the Secretary of War that advocates of a sea level canal "would oppose *unjustifiably*" any major change in the *existing* canal. This was a most significant warning by the well informed governor who recommended the proposal for the elimination of the Pedro Miguel Locks to the Secretary of War for comprehensive investigation ("Report on Proposals for the Elimination of Pedro Miguel Locks for the Panama Canal", par. 70, quoted in *Congressional Record*, Vol. 102, Pt. 8 (June 21, 1956), pp. 10756–66).

In this light, the two cited recommendations of the 1970 report for "modernizing the existing canal" and "opposing" the construction of additional locks are mutually contradictory as well as misleading. In consequence, the Comptroller General is in error in this connection and your committee should be so advised.

The Comptroller General's statement that the "action that should be taken with respect to the existing canal involves matters of national policy for determination by the Congress" is highly pertinent and serves to place responsibiilty squarely where it belongs—on the Congress.

The history of the 1939 Third Locks Project, as stated in the Comptroller General's comments on H.R. 712, is accurate as far as they go. There are, however, some factual omissions with serious budgetary, economic and financial implications as follows:

1. Expenditures so far made toward the major modernization of the existing canal include the following:

Third Locks Project, suspended in May, 1942	$76,357,405
Enlargement of Gaillard Cut and other channel improvements, completed on August 5, 1970	95,000,000
Total	$171,357,405

2. The "expansion or new construction" as provided in H.R. 712, which would authorize completion of an additional channel of larger locks for larger vessels, can be accomplished under existing treaty provisions without any indemnity to Panama whatever (Debate on Hull-Alfaro Treaty of 1936, *Congressional Record*, Vol. 84, Pt. 9 (July 24, 1939), p. 9834).

3. The total investment of the taxpayers of the United States in the Panama Canal enterprise, including its defense, from 1904 through June 30, 1968, was $6,368,009,000. Recoveries during the same period were $1,359,931,421, making a total net investment on the latter date of more than $5,000,000,000. The total net investment as of June 30, 1971, should be considerably greater.

4. The canal modernization plan provided in H.R. 712 will enable the maximum utilization of all work so far accomplished on the Panama Canal since 1914 without the danger of disastrous slides, without treaty involve-

ment, and with every assurance of success, which facts cannot be disregarded.

5. The *initial* cost estimate for the sea level project (Route 10) recommended in the December 1, 1970, report is $2,880,000,000, but this figure does not include provisions for (a) acquiring the necessary right of way and (b) an inevitable huge indemnity to Panama, which items were altogether ignored by the Anderson study group.

6. The sea-level proposal recommended in the 1970 report primarily for the alleged vulnerability of the existing canal and national defense hinges upon the cession to Panama by the United States of its sovereignty over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal with the total loss to the United States of all the extensive and valuable installations and structures in the Zone territory, the canal itself, and the Canal Zone.

7. As to such cessions the Comptroller General failed to make any reference to Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution, which vests the power to dispose of territory and other property of the United States in the Congress; that is to say, in the House and Senate. The Anderson panel report also ignores this Constitutional provision.

8. Any sea-level project, either in Panama or Canal Zone, would require a new treaty or treaties with Panama and thus open up a Pandora's box of problems, including diplomatic involvements with Great Britain and other great maritime nations as well as with Colombia (Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901 and the Thomson-Urrutia Treaty of 1914–22).

It is generally agreed by independent experienced and competent canal experts that the plan contemplated in H.R. 712 will provide the best operational canal practicable of achievement at least cost. The great costs involved in any sea-level undertaking would necessarily divert funds from urgent national defense and other programs of the United States as well as lead to a large increase in tolls.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., May 4, 1971.

Hon. EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter dated March 4, 1971, requesting our comments on H.R. 712, a bill "To provide for the increase of capacity and the improvement of operations of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes."

This bill would (1) direct the Governor of the Canal Zone, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, to proceed with the work necessary to increase the capacity and improve the operations of the Panama Canal in accordance with a modified version of the Third Locks project initially authorized by the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409) at a cost not to exceed $850 million, and (2) establish a five-member advisory and inspection board to oversee the planning and construction of the project.

The Third Locks project initially authorized by the act of August 11, 1939, contemplated the construction of a third lane of locks near each of the existing three lock sites at a cost not to exceed $277 million which was authorized to be appropriated. Construction was started in July 1940 and by May 1942 most of the lock excavation at the Miraflores and Gatun sites had been completed. However, at that time work was suspended due to World War II priority demands for labor and material, and the work has never been resumed.

The Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission was established pursuant to Public Law 88–609, as amended. In its final report to the President dated December 1, 1970, the Commission recommended that the existing canal be modernized to provide its maximum potential transit capacity, but that no additional locks should be constructed.

The question concerning the action that should be taken with respect to the existing canal involves matters of national policy for determination by the Congress. We have no recommendations to make regarding the proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

R. F. KELLER,
Assistant Comptroller General of the United States.

H.R. 712

A bill to provide for the increase of capacity and the improvement of operations of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Panama Canal Modernization Act".

SEC. 2. (a) The Governor of the Canal Zone, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized and directed to prosecute the work necessary to increase the capacity and improve the operations of the Panama Canal through the adaptation of the Third Locks project set forth in the report of the Governor of the Panama Canal, dated February 24, 1939 (House Document Numbered 210, Seventy-sixth Congress), and authorized to be undertaken by the Act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), with usable lock dimensions of not less than one hundred and forty feet by not less than one thousand two hundred feet by not less than forty-five feet, and including the following: elimination of the Pedro Miguel Locks, and consolidation of all Pacific locks near Miraflores in new lock structures to correspond with the locks capacity at Gatun, raise the summit water level to its optimum height of approximately ninety-two feet, and provide a summit-level lake anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal, together with such appurtenant structures, works, and facilities, and enlargements or improvements of existing channels, structures, works, and facilities, as may be deemed necessary, at an estimated total cost not to exceed $850,000,000, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated for this purpose.

(b) The provisions of the second sentence and the second paragraph of the Act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), shall apply with respect to the work authorized by subsection (a) of this section. As used in such Act, the terms "Governor of the Panama Canal", "Secretary of War", and "Panama Railroad Company" shall be held and considered to refer to the "Governor of the Canal Zone", "Secretary of the Army", and "Panama Canal Company," respectively, for the purposes of this Act.

(c) In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Governor of the Canal Zone may act and exercise his authority as President of the Panama Canal Company and may utilize the services and facilities of that company.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a board, to be known as the "Panama Canal Advisory and Inspection Board" (hereinafter referred to as the "Board").

(b) The Board shall be composed of five members who are citizens of the United States of America. Members of the Board shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows:

(1) one member from private life, experienced and skilled in private business (including engineering);

(2) two members from private life, experienced and skilled in the science of engineering;

(3) one member who is a commissioned officer of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army (retired); and

(4) one member who is a commissioned officer of the line, United States Navy (retired).

(c) The President shall designate as Chairman of the Board one of the members experienced and skilled in the science of engineering.

(d) The President shall fill each vacancy on the Board in the same manner as the original appointment.

(e) The Board shall cease to exist on that date designated by the President as the date on which its work under this Act is completed.

(f) The Chairman of the Board shall be paid basic pay at the rate provided for level II of the Executive Schedule in section 5313 of title 5, United States Code. The other members of the Board appointed from private life shall be paid basic pay at a per annum rate which is $500 less than the rate of basic pay of the Chairman. The members of the Board who are retired officers of the United States Army and the United States Navy each shall be paid at a rate of basic pay which, when added to his pay as a retired officer, will establish his total rate of pay from the United States at a per annum rate which is $500 less than the rate of basic pay of the Chairman.

(g) The Board shall appoint, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, a Secretary and such other personnel as may be necessary to carry out its functions and activities and shall fix their rates of basic pay in accordance with chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates. The Secretary and other personnel of the Board shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.

SEC. 4. (a) The Board is authorized and directed to study and review all plans and designs for the Third Locks project referred to in section 2(a) of this Act, to make on-the-site studies and inspections of the Third Locks project, and to obtain current information on all phases of planning and construction with respect to such project. The Governor of the Canal Zone shall furnish and make available to the Board at all times current information with respect to such plans, designs, and construction. No construction work shall be commenced at any stage of the Third Locks project unless the plans and designs for such work, and all changes and modifications of such plans and designs, have been submitted by the Governor of the Canal Zone to, and have had the prior approval of, the Board. The Board shall report promptly to the Governor of the Canal Zone the results of its studies and reviews of all plans and designs, including changes and modifications thereof, which have been submitted to the Board by the Governor of the Canal Zone, together with its approval or disapproval thereof, or its recommendations for changes or modifications thereof, and its reasons therefor.

(b) The Board shall submit to the President and to the Congress an annual report covering its activities and functions under this Act and the progress of the work on the Third Locks project and may submit, in its discretion, interim reports to the President and to the Congress with respect to these matters.

SEC. 5. For the purpose of conducting all studies, reviews, inquiries, and investigations deemed necessary by the Board in carrying out its functions and activities under this Act, the Board is authorized to utilize any official reports, documents, data, and papers in the possession of the United States Government and its officials; and the Board is

given power to designate and authorize any member, or other personnel, of the Board, to administer oaths and affirmations, subpena witnesses, take evidence, procure information and data, and require the production of any books, papers, or other documents and records which the Board may deem relevant or material to the performance of the functions and activities of the Board. Such attendance of witnesses, and the production of documentary evidence, may be required from any place in the United States, or any territory, or any other area under the control or jurisdiction of the United States, including the Canal Zone.

SEC. 6. In carrying out its functions and activities under this Act, the Board is authorized to obtain the services of experts and consultants or organizations there in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates not in excess of $200 per diem.

SEC. 7. Upon request of the Board, the head of any department, agency, or establishment in the executive branch of the Federal Government is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, for such period or periods as may be agreed upon by the Board and the head of the department, agency, or establishment concerned, any of the personnel of such department, agency, or establishment to assist the Board in carrying out its functions and activities under this Act.

SEC. 8. The Board may use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

SEC. 9. The Administrator of General Services or the President of the Panama Canal Company, or both, shall provide, on a reimbursable basis, such administrative support services for the Board as the Board may request.

SEC. 10. The Board may make expenditures for travel and subsistence expenses of members and personnel of the Board in accordance with chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, for rent of quarters at the seat of government and in the Canal Zone, and for such printing and binding as the Board deems necessary to carry out effectively its functions and activities under this Act.

SEC. 11. All expenses of the Board shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Chairman of the Board or by such other member or employee of the Board as the Chairman may designate.

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Board each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to carry out its functions and activities under this Act.

SEC. 13. Any provision of the Act of August 11, 1939 (54 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), or of any other statute, inconsistent with any provision of this Act is superseded, for the purposes of this Act, to the extent of such inconsistency.

FDA AND THE VITAMIN C RECALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing and reading much lately about the amazing properties of vitamin C for curing colds and other ills. There have been runs on stores selling vitamin C tablets, and books and articles are coming out almost as fast as orange blossoms.

The Food and Drug Administration on May 27, 1971, issued a news release nationwide advising that some vitamin C tablets on the market contain undeclared sodium ascorbate rather than ascorbic acid, and excessive use may be hazardous for some persons. But there was one gaping hole in the announcement—the agency failed to tell which vitamin C tablets were misbranded.

That is tantamount to the movie reviewer for the local newspaper telling his readers that a new film in town is poorly acted, poorly written, poorly directed, and a waste of their time and money, but refusing to tell them the title.

The FDA had available the following day a list of at least 13 brands of vitamin C tablets being recalled voluntarily by manufacturers because they contained sodium ascorbate instead of ascorbic acid. But did the agency include this with the news release or send it out later? No. Reporters and others who wanted to know names of the misbranded products had to call the FDA and ask to have the list sent to them.

This is a somewhat unusual practice, even for the industry oriented FDA. A more normal standard procedure is to specifically identify potentially hazardous products by brand name and manufacturer simultaneous with issuance of the warning.

Makers of these vitamin C tablets did not state on the product labels whether they were substituting sodium ascorbate for ascorbic acid.

I have been told by FDA people that some substitution has been going on for some time and the agency was unaware of it until a Seattle consumer began complaining that her vitamin C tablets did not taste right. Lab tests revealed the substitution, and further investigation showed it was widespread.

In normal vitamin C intake, the FDA reports, the substitution would not cause harm, but it could be dangerous for those taking vitamin C in large amounts and for those who must limit their sodium intake.

Anyone in doubt, should turn to the most common and safest form of vitamin C—an orange.

The first FDA Weekly Recall report published after the May 27 vitamin C warning named only seven of the 13 brands recalled, although all were known by the Washington office by at least May 28, when the list of 13 became available. That weekly report was issued on June 2.

According to the June 2 FDA Report, these vitamin C recalls began as early as April 14, more than 6 weeks before the public notice. One of the misbranded products appeared on the May 19 FDA Weekly report, 2 weeks after the manufacturer began calling it back; that incident, apparently, occured before the FDA considered the mislabeling problem great enough to issue a public notice.

The latest weekly FDA report, published yesterday, listed several additional vitamin C recalls, but four of the original 13 brands on the May 28 list still have not appeared on the weekly reports.

One problem in this particular consumer protection procedure is that industry is not always required to report its recalls to the FDA and very rarely, if ever, does industry report recalls to consumers.

Incidents such as this one involving misbranded vitamin C tablets perform a disservice to both the consumer and industry. FDA's failure to immediately identify the offending brands in its original news release was doubly misleading—it concealed from consumers the identity of the offending products and it cast shadows of doubt on manufacturers who were doing an honest and accurate job of labeling their products.

In the interest of informing all consumers of this potential hazard and protecting honest businesses, I am inserting in the RECORD the original FDA news release; the list of 13 original recalls supplied to me by the FDA, including the four that are yet to appear on a weekly recall report, plus those portions of the Weekly Recall reports pertaining to vitamin C tablets.

I would not have to do this if the FDA was adequately responsive to the public welfare. The proper procedure would have been for an immediate public notice by the agency, naming names and giving consumers all the necessary information

The news release follows:

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Rockville, Md., May 27, 1971.

The FDA advised today that the excessive use of some Vitamin C Tablets on the market may be hazardous for some individuals because they contain undeclared Sodium Ascorbate rather than Ascorbic Acid.

Sodium Ascorbate has nearly the same vitamin activity as Ascorbic Acid. However, use of the tablets containing Sodium Ascorbate by individuals who for medical reasons must restrict their sodium intake may result in high levels of sodium being ingested unknowingly.

Although the claims are unproven, high levels of Vitamin C have recently been advocated for treatment of the common cold and other health problems.

FDA is taking action to assure that Vitamin C products are properly formulated and labeled and that any improperly labeled products presently on the market are recalled.

VITAMIN C RECALLS

A press release re substitution of sodium ascorbate for ascorbic acid issued May 27, 1971.

Recalls to date are as follows:

Don Hall Labs, Portland, Oregon (mfr) Howe Products, Seattle, Wash. (recaller).

Pacific Pharmaceutical, Saugus, Calif. DBA Windsor Drug Co., Inc., Los Angeles, Calif. Vitamin C Chewable Ascorbic Acid 250 mg. Tablets.

Drug Aids, North Hollywood, Calif. Chewable Vitamin C Tablets, 100 mg. and 250 mg.

Bolar Pharmaceuticals, Brooklyn, N.Y., Ascorbic Acid 100 mg. and 250 mg.

Life Laboratories, Inc., North Hollywood, Calif. Vitamin C Chewable Tablets, 100 mg.

Universal Drug Co., Minneapolis, Minn., Vitamin C Chewable 250 mg. Tablets.

Raymond Pharmaceutical Inc., Pasadena, Calif., Mfr. for Pantechnics, Lts., Glendale, Calif., Pansorb C Chewable Wafer, 250 mg.

First Texas Pharmaceuticals, Dallas, Texas, Vitamin C Chewable, 100 and 250 mg.

Hilcoa, Labs, San Francisco, Calif., Currant 300 Vitamin C Comples.

Robinson Labs, San Francisco, Calif., Ascorbic Acid Chewable Orange Flavored, 100 mg.

Robinson Labs, San Francisco, Calif., Ascorbic Acid Chewable Flavored Vitamin C, 250 mg.

United Pharmaceutical, Oakland, Calif., Vitamin C (brand new Ceevite).

West Coast Labs, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif., Dist. by Daylin Products, Los Angeles, Calif.

FDA WEEKLY RECALL REPORT THURSDAY, MAY 13, 1971, THROUGH WEDNESDAY, MAY 19, 1971

No.	Name, form, and label	Product type	Lot number	Quantity	Manufacturer, packer or distributor	Responsible for handling recall	Reason	Recall type	Depth	Product distribution
15	Vitamin C chewable (ascorbic acid) 250 mg. tabs Ibid Windsor Drug Co., Los Angeles, Calif., Sav-On Drug Co., Los Angeles, Calif., Fed-Co, Professional Pharmacy Division of Fed-Co, Los Angeles, Calif.	OTC	82271	70,120 tabs. dist. 4/9/71 to 4/20/71. Est. 50,000 tabs. remain on mkt.	Pacific Pharm Corp. Saugus, Calif.	Same	Mislabeled [1]	Voluntary (phone 5/4/71).	Retail	Southern California.
	Vitamin C Ascorbic Acid 250 mg. USP, chewable orange flavor, 100 tabs. (Dist. Brulon Pharmacal Co., Minneapolis, Minn.)	OTC	15220	313/100 tab. btls. from total of 626/100 tab. btls. dist. since 2/24/71. Est. rate of use 250/100 tab. btls./mo.	(Mfr.) Danbury Pharmacal Inc., Danbury, Conn.	(Recalling firm) Universal Drug Co., Inc., Mpls., Minn. DBA The Drug Specialties Co., and Brulon Pharmacal Co.	Misbranded [2]	Voluntary (letter 5/6/71).	Retail	Minn., Wis., N. Dak.
	Vitamin C Ascorbic Acid 100 mg., bulk tabs, Ibid for repackaging only. (Mfrd. by Bolar Pharmaceutical Co., Copiague, N.Y.)	OTC	011052, 10094, 011101, 011102, 011098, 011101, 100903, 011099, 100903, 011099.	During 11/70 thru 5/71 firm mfd. and dist. 1 million/100 mg. tab. and 2,478,000/250 mg. tabs.[3].	(Mfr.) Bolar Pharmaceutical Co., Inc., Copiague, N.Y.	do	Misbranded [4]	Voluntary (phone 5/10/71; letters 5/12/71).	Wholesale	N.Y. and N.J.
	Same as above (bulk tabs 250 mg. Bolar label)	OTC	011052, 10094, 011101, 011102, 011098, 011101, 100903, 011099, 100903, 011099.	do	do	do	do	do	do	Do.
	Same as above (1,000's ascorbic acid tabs., 250 mg.—mfd. for Sherry Pharmaceutical Co., Bayshore, N.Y.)	OTC	011052, 10094, 011101, 011102, 011098, 011101, 100903, 011099, 100903, 011099.	do	do	do	do	do	do	Do.
11	Ascorbic acid tabs. USP, 100 mg., Vitamin C chewable orange flavored, 100 and 1,000 tab. btls. (Robinson Lab., Inc., San Francisco, Calif.)	OTC	All	Products marketed bet. 1952 and May 21, 1971. 250 mg.; 96,300 tabs. 100 mg.; 66,500 tabls. dist. since 3/1/71. Est. rate of use 250 mg; 45,000 tabs / mo. 100 mg.; 33,000 tabls /mo.	(Mfr.) West Coast Labs., Gardena, Calif.	(Recalling firm) Robinson Labs., San Francisco, Calif.	do	Voluntary (letters 5/21/71).	do	Calif., Utah, Ill., Colo., Alaska, Ohio.
	Ascorbic acid tabs. USP, 250 mg. chewable flavored Vitamin C, 100 and 1,000 tab. btls.	OTC	All	do	do	do	do	do	do	Do
9	Currant 300 Vitamin C complex, 130 wafers. Hilcoa Corp., San Jose, Calif. Sea-Mann Exclusive—Base.	OTC	All	Product dist. starting spring 1969 to 5/22/71. Very small stocks est. to remain on mkt. 10,980/130 wafer btls. dist. in last 6 months. Est. rate of use 1,800/130 wafer btls.	(Mfr.) Hilcoa Lab. San Jose, Calif.	(Recalling firm) Hilcoa Corp., San Jose, Calif.	Misbranded [3]	Voluntary (letters 5/25/71).	Retail	Calif., Colo., Tex., Mo., and Ill.
10	Ceevite Ascorbic acid, Vitamin C, 250 mg, flavored. (Dist. by United Pharmaceuticals Inc., Oakland, Calif.—150 tab btls.).	OTC	All	Product dist. bet. 1968 to 5/12/71. 200,000 tabs. sold during last 6 months. Est. rate of use 50,000 tabs./mo.	(Mfr.) Strong Cobb Arner, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio.	(Recalling firm) United Pharmaceuticals, Oakland, Calif.	do.[3]	Voluntary (letter and phone 5/25/71).	do	Calif.
21	Vitamin C (Ascorbic acid) 100 mg. (Howe Products, Inc., Seattle, Wash.).	OTC	58564, 58363, 58362, 57864, 57865.	754,200/100 mg. tabs were repacked. 82 doz. 250's; 48 doz. 100's; 44 doz. 250's; 102 doz. 100's and 70 11/12 doz. 100's dist. bet. 1/25/71 and 2/17/71. Est. rate of use 2,000,000 tabs./mo.	(Mfr.) Don Hall Labs., Portland, Oreg.	(Recalling firm) Howe Products, Inc. Seattle, Wash.	do	Voluntary (phone 4/14/71; letter 4/16/71).	do	Washington, Oregon and Kansas.

[1] Mislabeled labeling declares ascorbic acid 250 mg. Firm's formulation shows ingredients 125 mg., ascorbic acid and 125 mg. plus 10 percent excess sodium ascorbate.

[2] The bulk drug is labeled to contain sodium ascorbate and ascorbic acid and not USP. The repackaged drug is labeled ascorbic acid 250 mg. USP misbranding the product.

[3] All 1,000,000/100 mg. bulk tabs. are intact at Interstate Drug Exchange, Plainview, N.Y. Also at IDE, are 1,060,000 tabs./250 mg. The remainder, 225,000 were shipped to Paramount Drugs, Northvale, N.J., plus 225,000 tabs shipped to L.T. York, Brookfield, Mo. Firm has 470 btls. on hand.

[4] Analysis revealed firm substituting approx. 50 percent to 100 percent sodium ascorbate in its production of some batches of ascorbic acid tabs.

Note: Compiled and edited by the Office of Public Information, Food and Drug Administration, DHEW, Washington, D.C.

THURSDAY, JUNE 3, 1971 THROUGH WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 1971

No.	Name, form, and label	Product type	Lot number	Quantity	Manufacturer, packer, or distributor	Responsible for handling recall	Reason	Recall type	Depth	Product distribution
1	Orange flavored Vit. C, 100 mg. (Dist. Longs Drug Stores, Walnut Creek, Calif.)	OTC	All	2,111,000/100 mg. tabs. dist. in last 5 months.	(Mfr.) Stayner Corp., Berkeley, Calif.	(Recalling firm) Howe Products, Inc., Seattle, Wash.	Misbranded [1]	Voluntary (5/25/71).	Retail	Calif., and Hawaii.
	Same as above—250 mg.	OTC	All	3,288,100/250 mg. tabs. dist. in last 5 months.	do	do	do	do	do	Do.
4	Candy-Cee Chewable Vitamin C tabs. 100 mg. in 100 tab. btls. (Dist. Daylin Products, Los Angeles, Calif.).	OTC	410471	100 doz./100 mg. tab. btls. shipped since 4/71. No est. available of amt. on mkt.	(Mfr.) West Coast Labs., Gardena, Calif.	do	do	Voluntary (letter 5/27/71).	do	National.
5	Orange Flavored Vitamin C ascorbic acid in 100 and 250 tab. btls. (Stayner, Corp., Berkeley, Calif.).	OTC	All	911, 650/100 mg. tabs. and 186,050/250 mg. tabs. dist. in last 5 months.	(Mfr.) Stayner Corp., Berkeley, Calif.	do	Misbranded [1]	Voluntary (phone and letters 5/26/71).	do	Calif. and Hawaii.
6	'C-Rola-300' chewable Vitamin C wafers—300 mg., in 50 and 100 wafer btls. (Anabolic, Inc., Glendale, Calif.).	OTC	All	2,985,550 wafers dist. from Sept. 1967 through May 10, 1971. Est. 300/50's and 600/100's remain on mkt. Est. rate of use 254/50's and 600/100's per mo.	(Mfr.) Anabolic, Inc., Glendale, Calif.	(Recalling firm) Anabolic Foods, Inc., Glendale, Calif.	do [1]	Voluntary (letter 5/10/71).	do	National.
7	Payless Vitamin C, ascrobic acid, flavored, chewable 100 mg. tabs. (Dist. Skaggs Payless Drugs Stores, Oakland, Calif.).	OTC	All	1,177,000 tabs. dist. during last 5 months.	(Mfr.) Stayner Corp., Berkeley, Calif.	do	do [1]	Voluntary (5/25/71).	do	California.
	Same as above 250 mg..	OTC	All	72,365,000/250 mg. tabs. dist. in last 5 months.	do	do	do [1]	do	do	Do.
8	Orange flavored Vitamin C, 100 mg. in 100, 250 and 365 tab. btls. (Thrifty Drug Stores, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.)	OTC	All	7,488/100 tab. btls.; 4,752/250 tab. btls.; 6,000/365 tab. btls. dist. in last 5 months.	(Mfr.) Stayner Corp., Berkeley, Calif.	do	do [1]	do	do	Do.

[1] Labels do not declare presence of sodium ascorbate in product.
[2] Formulation is combination of ascorbic acid and sodium ascorbate. Labeling declares ascorbic acid as source of Vitamin C.

Note: Compiled and edited by the Office of Public Information, Food and Drug Administration, DHEW, Washington, D.C.

TREATMENT RECEIVED IN SOVIET UNION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL) is recognized for 30 mintues.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many of my colleagues would be astounded to hear of the treatment I received while on a recent visit to the Soviet Union. While there I became well versed in the plight of the Soviet Jew and, while there, I also received a dose of the Russian form of "hospitality."

The trip, from beginning to end, was a constant nightmare of harassment and intimidation. I was a virtual prisoner during the entire stay in the U.S.S.R. I document my trip in two parts, with today's section dealing with problems getting a visa:

MAYBE TOMORROW, CONGRESSMAN

My experience with Russian obstinance and incompetence began long before my departure date. The obnoxious Russian bureaucracy even manages to flourish in this country.

The following is a short diary of the problems encountered in just getting a visa and travel arrangements completed before my departure date:

Thursday, April 29, 1971: The American Express (Washington office) was contacted and informed of Representative Bertram L. Podell's travel plans to Moscow to begin on Friday, May 21, 1971 and to depart Moscow on May 29, 1971, with two days during this period to be earmarked for Leningrad. I was told by American Express that I had to send a check in the amount of $25.00 as a deposit before they could then contact Intourist Agency (the Moscow Clearing House for Russian visas). The necessary check in the amount of $25.00 was forwarded. On this same date, travel arrangements were made with PAN AM AIRLINES for their Flight 44—departing JFK (International Airport, New York) at 10:45 p.m. for Moscow on Friday, May 21, 1971. Confirmation for this flight was obtained on this same date.

Monday, May 10, 1971: American Express phoned the office today and reported: "No word yet from Intourist Agency about your trip but current reports show Moscow completely sold out for May 25, 1971 through June 1, 1971 with no foreign reservation being accepted; however, Intourist may be trying to squeeze you in or they (Intourist) may approve only the May 22, 1971 through May 24, 1971 part of the trip. If May 25, 1971 through May 28, 1971 is disapproved in Moscow, Leningrad is open for reservation. If you prefer you could leave the U.S.A. on Monday, May 17 or Thursday, May 20th."

Wednesday, May 12, 1971: Our Soviet desk officers at State Department were called today to help facilitate the issuance of the visa.

Thursday, May 13, 1971: The Soviet desk at the State Department called today and said: "My visa was incomplete as additional photos were needed." The additional photos were hand carried to the Russian Consulate. A call was made to American Express to see what progress was being made on Intourist Agency's confirmation of the voucher numbers. None as yet. A call was again made to the Soviet Desk at our State Department to see if they had any cables from our Embassy in Moscow; again, the answer was "Not as yet"—Maybe Tomorrow, Congressman. This later phrase seemed to set the tenor throughout this whole period.

Friday, May 14, 1971: American Express called and said they had a cable from Intourist Agency in Moscow and that my voucher number was confirmed. The State Department called with the identical news received from our Embassy in Moscow.

Wednesday, May 19, 1971: The State Department called and read the following cable: "The Nationale Hotel has confirmed a deluxe room commencing May 22 through May 25, then on your arrival in Leningrad, a deluxe hotel room at the Astoria Hotel was confirmed for May 26, May 27 and a departure date on May 28 for Moscow—again stay at the Hotel Nationale in Moscow on May 28 and depart Moscow on May 29." At this stage, my office was informed that all was in order and that the actions taken by the Intourist Agency were done with such rare intelligence and such action was most unusual—this information was given by both our own State Department people and the American Express Agency here in Washington. BUT—the visa still was not signed. At approximately 7:00 p.m. this evening the State Department called with the long awaited news: "The visa is ready and can be picked up in the morning between 9:00 a.m. and noon."

Thursday, May 20, 1971: My assistant, Peggy Murphy, arrived at the Consular Section's office at 10 past 9—she was "whisked" into a dreary little office and was told that the visa couldn't be released until they were signed by Mr. Vadim Kavalerov (Director of the Consular Section for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), however, Mr. Kavalerov was expected momentarily. The approaching noon hour was arriving—so Miss Murphy asked another assistant to Mr. Kavalerov, if

Mr. Kavalerov would be in later that afternoon. She was assured that he would be. So she came back to the office and told me what had happened. Being very perplexed, we called the State Department and let them know what had taken place. The State Department (our Soviet desk officers) said a call would then be placed to Mr. Kavalerov and we would be called right back. At 10 to one this afternoon, the State Department called and said that while Mr. Kavalerov was away from his office, his first assistant, Mr. Bordin would be there and that Miss Murphy should come back to the Consular office. Miss Murphy arrived at the Consular office at approximately 1:30 p.m.—she was again whisked into the very dreary little waiting room. A Soviet assistant was there again to greet her—every so often he would come out to her and say they were trying to locate Mr. Kavalerov—and that he was expected very soon. During this particular "seance" he asked her very "clandestinely" if she was a member of the Jewish faith. She said she wasn't. She asked the assistant if she could use one of their phones to call and tell me that she was still at the Consular's office and that she was waiting for Mr. Kavalerov to return to sign the visa. He said "oh yes" but could she wait another 15 minutes as all their phones were busy. Since the Consular office is located in a strictly residential area in the upper northwest area of the District of Columbia, there were no drug stores or other public places around for her to go outside and use a public telephone—in short, she would have to have taken a cab or a bus to the Woodner Apt. Hotel (a good mile away from the Consular office) to have access to a public phone. She made two more attempts with Mr. Costioff to use the phone, without success. She was then called to the phone and to her surprise, it was Mr. Scanlon (one of the Soviet desk officers at the State Department we had been working with) to say that apparently orders came from Moscow to hold up the signing of the visa and to leave—this was now 10 to five. I was again told that it was still possible that the visa would be signed the following day (Friday, May 21)—the day that I was to depart. I couldn't believe it; but decided to stay overnight in Washington as it now became a real challenge. What Harassment!

Friday, May 21, 1971: At approximately 9:30 this morning I had a call put in to Secretary of State Bill Rogers, only to be told that he was at the White House. I then asked to speak with Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, U. Alexis Johnson (former Ambasador to the U.S.S.R.). Alexis Johnson came to the phone—I told him of the shabby treatment I was receiving and would he please call Ambassador Dobryin (Soviet Ambassador to the U.S.A.)—he said he would immediately, and did—finally, at 3:00 this afternoon I was convinced that we would never get the visa—so I decided to take the 4:00 shuttle back to New York. At 5:40 this evening, Miss Murphy received a call from the State Department and was told that the visa was signed and that she would have to pick them up by six o'clock as the office closed then. After Miss Murphy received the signed visa she met with another assistant of mine, Miss Hoffman, then took the visa and cabbed it to National Airport—caught an 8:00 o'clock shuttle to New York where I met her at JFK airport with the visa. The miracle did happen—and I left on schedule on Pan Am's flght No. 44 to Moscow, arriving in Moscow on May 22, 1971, at 5:05 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, next week I shall talk of the treatment I received during my visit to the Soviet Union.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL—PART IV

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, this is another in a series of articles and testimony concerning the defense authorization bill. The testimony was given by Mr. Sanford Gottlieb in open hearings before the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. Gottlieb is currently an executive director of SANE and expresses the concern that many Americans have today. He addresses the question of American interests and commitments. Since 1947, we have assumed no less than 47 military commitments—and that number does not include Israel or Ethiopia. He further points out that these military commitments are supported primarily by general purpose forces. As much as $60 billion of the administration budget request for fiscal year 1972 is for general purpose and related forces, including Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment to hold the fiscal year 1972 authorization to the current year's level does not identify where particular cuts should be made. But, Mr. Gottlieb has clearly pointed out that the foreign policy assumptions which underly the lion's share of the administration's budget request are subject to serious question:

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF SANFORD GOTTLEIB, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF SANE

We very much appreciate the willingness of the Committee to hear public witnesses for the first time in open session during consideration of a military authorization bill. This is a most welcome step since the military budget in recent years has consumed about half of the controllable funds upon which Congress is asked to vote. This large slice of the federal pie exercises a major influence not only upon the foreign policy of the United States, but also upon the conditions of life for its citizens.

Since 1946 the United States has spent more than $1 trillion for military programs. We have invested in the most powerful military establishment in history. We have done so in the name of national security. As we understand it, the concept of national security can be divided into a primary function of preserving the safety of the American people (usually called deterrence in the nuclear age) and a secondary function of defending American interests elsewhere in the world.

We believe the Congress in general and the Armed Services Committees in particular have a near-impossible task of making judgments about military program requested by the Executive Branch. This is manifest where deterrence is concerned; it is much more obvious where American interests abroad are concerned. It is to these interests that we would like to address most of this testimony.

In his first State of the World Message President Nixon said, and he repeated again this year: "Our interests must shape our commitments, rather than the other way around."

Yet these interests are rarely defined at any level of government, and there has been no effort to separate *vital* interests from secondary interests. The United States has publicly assumed military commitments to 47 countries since 1947, often without defining our vital interests, the nature of the threat to these interests, or the possible consequences of American military involvement in these countries.

The 47 nations which have received public military commitments from the United States are:

Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance (Rio Treaty 1947): 1. Argentina. 2. Bolivia. 3. Brazil. 4. Chile. 5. Colombia. 6. Costa Rica. 7. Dominican Republic. 8. Ecuador. 9. El Salvador. 10. Guatemala. 11. Haiti, 12. Honduras. 13. Mexico, 14. Nicaragua, 15. Panama, 16. Paraguay, 17. Peru, 18. Trinidad and Tobago, 19. Uruguay, and 20. Venezuela.

North Atlantic Treaty (NATO, 1949): 21. Belguim, 22. Canada, 23. Denmark, 24. Federal Republic of Germany, 25. France, 26. Greece, 27. Iceland, 28. Italy, 29. Luxembourg, 30. the Netherlands, 31. Norway, 32. Portugal, 33. Turkey, 34. United Kingdom.

Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines (1951)—35.

Security Treaty between Australia, New Zealand and the United States (ANZUS, 1951)—36 and 37.

Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty (SEATO 1954)—(38) Pakistan, and (39) Thailand were added to the prior commitments made under other treaties with Australia, France, New Zealand, the Philippines and the United Kingdom. In addition, by a protocol signed on the same date as the SEATO Treaty, the states of (40) Cambodia, (41) Laos and (42) South Vietnam were designed for the purposes of Article IV of the Treaty.

Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of China (1954)—43.

Declaration Respecting the Baghdad Pact Between the United States of America and Iran, Pakistan, Turkey and the United Kingdom (1958)—(44) Iran was added to the prior commitments made under other treaties with Pakistan, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

Agreement of Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Liberia (1959)—45.

Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security Between the United States and Japan (1960)—46.

Joint Declaration by Spain and the United States of America Concerning the Renewal of the Defense Agreement of September 26, 1953 (1963) and Joint Communique of March 26, 1969—47.

This information comes from the study, "Collective Defense Treaties," prepared by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and published April 21, 1969. The fact that the Committee on Foreign Affairs no longer has any copies available is perhaps evidence that there has been intense interest in the question of national commitments. We hope so. May I suggest that the Armed Services Committee secure copies of this study from the Government Printing Office and make them available to the members. It is a most illuminating document.

The agreements listed in this document do not include the more informal commitments such as the one to Israel, or the secret commitments such as the one to train and assist a 40,000-man Ethiopian army, as revealed by the Senate Subcommittee on Security Agreements Abroad.

These military commitments by the United States are supported primarily by general purpose forces. The Administration's request for Fiscal Year 1972 for general purpose and related forces, including Vietnam, is $59.5 billion out of a total of $76 billion. The sum requested represents not only the lion's share of the military budget, but also an increase of $1.3 billion over the Fiscal 1971 level.

Why this increase? What is the nature of the threat to our national security which warrants this enormous sum?

In his 1971 State of the World Message President Nixon said: "In the last 20 years, the nature of the Communist challenge has been transformed. The Stalinist bloc has fragmented into competing centers of doctrine and power. One of the deepest conflicts in the world today is between Communist China and the Soviet Union. The most preva-

lent Communist threats now are not massive military invasions, but a more subtle mix of military, psychological and political pressures."

If the most prevalent Communist threats now are a more subtle mix of military, psychological and political pressures, how and where do these pressures affect the vital interests and national security of the United States? And how are such pressures resisted by an increase in American conventional forces? Before the taxpayers are asked to spend more money for general purpose forces, it would seem to us that these questions must be addressed.

We are unaware that there is any generally accepted theory of how the conventional military forces of a superpower can be used successfully to resist a subtle mix of military, psychological and political pressures, especially when that superpower has at least 48 allies on all continents. The war in Indo-China has shown, at terrible cost, the limitations of American military power when used in a guerrilla war against a highly motivated foe. What is the effectiveness of this military power when its use is merely threatened to counter a subtle mix of pressures?

Let us be specific. Pakistan received an American military commitment as a party to the SEATO Treaty in 1954. Did that commitment prevent the Pakistanis from engaging in a war against India during this period, with both sides using American-made tanks? If the current tensions between East and West Pakistan lead to the political as well as geographic division of that unhappy country, will the American commitment enhance the security of either new state? Will the United States find itself being asked to make a 48th public commitment—to both Pakistans? If the Chinese apply a subtle mix of military, psychological and political pressure to West Pakistan, how will we carry out our commitment?

A careful reading of the Administration's statements indicates that American military forces may be used to deal with political agitation, insurgency and guerrilla warfare throughout the world. If this is so, we have learned nothing from Indo-China and the Nixon Doctrine is simply a cover for continued American military intervention in the internal affairs of other countries. Quite apart from the rights and wrongs of such intervention, we should have learned by now that it often spells disaster for all parties concerned, including those whose homeland is far away.

Mr. Chairman, we know that the questions we have raised are bothersome. Our purpose in raising them is to encourage a discussion of the premises on which this country supports its military programs. As we have said before to this Committee, we do not have the answers but we intend to continue asking the questions until there is a meaningful dialogue on national security.

To move a step forward toward such a dialogue permit me to suggest a few basic criteria to help define a nation's vital interests:

1. Geographic proximity. Clearly, all nations are concerned about potentially hostile military activities near their borders. Where the United States is concerned this criterion would apply to Canada, Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean, and the waters surrounding Alaska and Hawaii.

2. Major trading partners. Nations are concerned with the security of other nations with which they conduct a substantial share of their trade or upon which they are primarily dependent for basic raw materials. Where the United States is concerned, this criterion applies mainly to Western Europe and Japan and the sea lanes to these regions. By the same criterion, Latin America and the Middle East are secondary interests.

Once we have cited these two basic and clear-cut criteria, we enter an area of fuzziness. Take, for example, the criterion of national affinity. Nations are likely to consider that they have a special interest in other areas populated by the same ethnic group or sharing the same culture or historical experience. However, this criterion raises more questions than it answers. Does the presence of millions of overseas Chinese throughout Southeast Asia give China a vital interest in that area? If Americans think that the United States has a vital interest in Western Europe because a majority of its population is descended from the peoples of that region, what is our interest in Southern and Eastern Europe from whose peoples about 40 million Americans are descended? And what of Western Africa from whose peoples about 11% of our population is descended?

Then, there may be special cases which amount to moral rather than vital interests. Israel could be considered in this category, as a country created under unique circumstances by the United Nations to provide a homeland for the survivors of genocide, in a region surrounded by hostile neighbors. It might help the discussion of the conflict in the Middle East if there were general acceptance within the United States of such a moral commitment, rather than the implication by some that we have a vital interest and by others that we have no interest in that area.

Mr. Chairman, it is clearly difficult to define a nation's vital interests. But surely this task must be undertaken if the United States is to measure whether its security is really endangered in a given region of the world. Unless vital interests are clearly at stake, there should be no military commitments except in very special circumstances.

If such rigorous standards were applied, we might be able drastically to reduce our military commitments, our military expenditures, and our tendency to make other peoples' squabble our own.

WILL MASLOW'S REPLY TO ARON VERGELIS

(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, on May 21 of this year, a statement by Mr. Aron Vergelis appeared in the New York Times. In that statement Mr. Vergelis defended Soviet policy toward the Jews. He said there was no discrimination against Jews in the Soviet Union and denied that they were prohibited to emigrate.

I responded to Mr. Vergelis directly on May 27 and a copy of my letter to him appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date.

In today's New York Times there appears a letter by Will Maslow, executive director of the American Jewish Congress, which is in my judgment the definitive response to the fabrications contained in Mr. Vergelis' article. I append for our colleagues information Will Maslow's letter:

FATE OF JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

To the Editor:

Aron Vergelis, whose article appeared on the Op-Ed page May 21, is a well-known apologist for the Soviet Union. Indeed, by virtue of his position as editor of Sovietish Heimland, he is a functionary of the Soviet state. His statement must be understood in terms of the allegiance he has sworn to the rulers of Soviet Russia.

Mr. Vergelis has no similar allegiance to the truth. He insists that Jewish religion and culture are flourishing in the U.S.S.R. But the facts are these:

Some 160,000 Jewish students attended an estimated 11,000 classes in the Soviet Union's Jewish schools in 1937; today there is not a single classroom in the Soviet Union where Jewish culture and history are taught.

In 1956 there were 450 synagogues in the U.S.S.R.; in 1969 the number of synagogues has declined to 55. In all of the Soviet Union there are only three functioning rabbis, two of them more than 75 years old. There are only three Yeshiva students in the Soviet Union—two of them old men.

The last Hebrew Bible was printed in the Soviet Union in 1917. There were 117 Yiddish books published in the U.S.S.R. in 1947 and 1948. During 1960–68 only eight Yiddish books were published.

There were 16 Jewish theatres and two academies of Jewish dramatic art in 1953. Today there are only a few semi-professional companies scattered in Vilnius, Biro-Bidjan and Kishnev.

Not only is there a determined effort to destroy Jewish religious and cultural life in the U.S.S.R. but discrimination against Jews in almost all aspects of Soviet life is notorious.

There were 47 Jewish members of the Supreme Soviet in 1937. There are only four today. In 1939, 10.8 per cent of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist party were Jewish. Today there is only one Jewish member.

Jews are denied access to Soviet military academies and to training schools for diplomats and suffer from a quota system in the elite Soviet universities.

Finally, Soviet Jews have been subject over the past quarter-century to a campaign of vicious anti-Semitism, starting with the arrest of Jewish cultural leaders in 1948, the infamous "Doctor's Plot" of Stalin's last days and, most recently, the use of Nazi-style stereotypes in a thinly-disguised campaign of "anti-Zionism" that everyone in the Soviet Union—Jew and non-Jew alike—knows means anti-Semitism.

It is as a result of this burden of discrimination and deprivation that some 80,000 Soviet Jewish families have had the courage to risk their jobs, their homes, their education—even their very lives—by applying for emigration. We have every reason to believe that hundreds of thousands more Jews would apply for emigration if they did not have to put themselves and their families in peril for doing so.

But there is no reason to take anyone's word for it—ours or Mr. Vergelis'. Just let the U.S.S.R. announce that all Jews who wish to emigrate may do so. If Soviet Jews are content to remain in the U.S.S.R., there will be no rush to the emigration offices and Mr. Vergelis' position will be vindicated.

Unfortunately, there is little likelihood that the men in the Kremlin are willing to run the risk of making such an announcement. For they know—as Mr. Vergelis knows in his heart—that the U.S.S.R. is a great prison for Jewry; that Jewish cultural and religious life is being starved and suffocated by the Soviet state, and that the U.S.S.R. has become the world's greatest purveyor of anti-Semitism.

This is why world Jewry has mobilized in support of Soviet Jewry's struggle to be free. And all of Aron Vergelis' pathetic excuses and explanation cannot hide this truth.

WILL MASLOW,
Executive Director, American Jewish Congress.

NEW YORK, *May 24, 1971.*

MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE PROJECTS 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, in 1963, a significant new comprehensive medical care program was authorized under title V of the Social Security Act. The maternity and infant care projects were initiated to provide high-quality infant and maternity care to low-income, high-risk patients. As the appropriation for these special projects and the children and youth projects will be up for review shortly by this body, I would like to bring to the attention of my distinguished colleagues the great contribution these programs are making in the reduction of infant and maternal mortality throughout the Nation.

As a result of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation, data became available in 1962 that indicated that thousands of low-income women, especially those in our inner city ghetto areas, were giving birth to premature and low birth weight babies at two and one-half times the expected rate, and that these low birth weight babies were likely to have brain damage. Statistics also indicated that infant mortality rates in our major cities were much higher than the national rate and that the mortality rate among black infants were twice that of whites. Infant mortality is an excellent measure of social progress and social pathology. It is indicative of the serious discrepancies that exist in the amount and quality of care provided to poor mothers and children compared to their middle-class counterparts. The maternal and infant care projects were established in response to these inequities to help major cities cope with the problems they were experiencing in providing adequate care for low-income pregnant women and their infants.

Maternity and infant care programs became a reality in the spring of 1964 and today there are 55 projects in operation in 35 different States. These projects are providing comprehensive health services to women including prenatal care, hospital inpatient care, delivery and postpartum care to about 125,000 women a year. Care of the newborn infant during the first year of life is also provided, further improving the quality of life.

If we examine infant mortality rates over the past 35 years, we see that in general the rates have decreased steadily. In the decade between 1950 and 1960, however, there was a significant trend toward higher infant mortality rates in most major cities. This was due to the great urbanization process going on in this country, bringing millions of low income people into the hearts of our major cities. During the period between 1960 and 1965, only three of the 21 larger cities had a significant annual reduction in their infant mortality rates. In 1966, there was a sudden change, and the national rate decreased 4 percent over the previous year. This has continued, and now the trend toward higher infant mortality rates has been dramatically reversed. Large cities are experiencing greater reductions in infant mortality rates than the Nation as a whole. Although the dramatic change in infant mortality has not been established in a cause and effect relationship with the maternal and infant care projects, the projects have been identified as one new contributing factor. If all the States are classified into four groups in accordance with the number of maternity and infant care projects in these States, it will be seen that the States which have the largest number of projects and which projects have had the longest period of operation have the largest annual reduction in infant mortality since 1965. Data has now become available which indicates that infant mortality rates of infants born under these projects are significantly lower than infant mortality rates of the cities as a whole.

For example, the neonatal mortality rate—infant deaths in the first few months of life—in New York City in 1966 was 18.6 per thousand live births; for the 4,214 infants born under the maternal and infant care project in that year was only 16.1, a difference of greater than 13 percent. In Puerto Rico, the districts in the northeast region which have a maternal and infant care project in operation has an infant mortality rate of 23.8 in 1967, having experienced a sharp reduction over the previous 2 years. Two other districts in the same region which do not have such a program in operation, have an infant mortality rate that has shown little change in 3 years.

Individual institutions also seem to be favorably affected by maternity and infant care projects. For example, the University of Arkansas Medical Center experienced a 40-percent reduction in the stillborn and neonatal mortality rates in the 3-year period in which its project was in operation.

The maternal and infant care projects are successfully demonstrating that mortality in excess of the national rate is preventable. Community efforts on behalf of low-income mothers and infants do improve material and infant mortality rates. The United States can expect to see an even more dramatic reduction in its infant mortality rate achieved when the right of every pregnant woman and her infant to good medical care becomes a reality, and when the delivery of quality medical care to pregnant women and their infants of every income level becomes a national priority.

The American Academy of Pediatrics and the Coalition for Health Funding recommend that the maternal and infant care and children and youth special projects receive an appropriation of $130 million for fiscal year 1972. These recommendations bear consideration due to the impact of these special programs toward improving the quality of life among low-income families. I urge our colleagues to bear these comments in mind and support an increased appropriation for these meaningful programs and to become cosponsors of H.R. 8799 which now has 49 sponsors.

HUNGER IN THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. ROUSH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to address my remarks before this body to the matter of national priorities, especially in view of the fact that in a short time a number of bills, proposing the appropriation of billions of dollars for various Government agencies and programs, will be appearing before the House.

There are many contradictions in our society today. We are the wealthiest nation in the world, yet we are poor in jobs for both skilled and unskilled; we offer money for development to the so-called underdeveloped nations, but fail to develop the regions and people of our own Nation that are confined in the chains of poverty; we preach democracy but practice discrimination; we talk of peace but continue fighting in Indochina; we possess a rare engineering and technical genius as a nation, but we have been unable to find solutions to urban crowding and the pollution of our environment, to the high rate of infant mortality, to the high death rate in automobiles.

There is yet another contradiction that I would bring to your attention today, and that is the matter of massive malnutrition, hunger, starvation on the part of thousands of Americans in a nation where overfeeding and dieting are the fads of the affluent. Specifically, I am here to urge full and immediate publication of the findings of the national nutrition survey.

We usually tend to think that hunger and starvation are visited upon children and adults in other countries. Well, both happen to young and old right here in the United States as Hunger USA vividly recorded and as numerous congressional hearings documented. We now know clearly that vitamin and calories deficiencies affect the physical and mental growth of our citizens, their capacity and interest in work and achievement, their opportunity to live a full and fruitful life. And, we know the poor are the chief victims of this malnutrition.

But what are we doing about it? Much less than we should. That is the reason I am proposing legislation here today.

In 1967, the Congress mandated a comprehensive survey of the incidence and location of serious hunger and malnutrition and the health problems incident thereto in the United States.

Between 1968 and 1970, a study of biochemical data was made in 10 States—South Carolina, Louisiana, Texas, Kentucky, West Virginia, California, New York, Massachusetts, Michigan, and Washington—to determine the hemoglobin level, the levels of vitamin A and C, the serum albumin level, the incidence of protein malnutrition, calorie-protein malnutrition in a sampling of people in those States.

The irony is that that report in full has not been published. A preliminary, but incomplete, report was sent to each Congressman 2 months ago, but the final

report has not been issued, although data collection is completed. Is this partial report all that can be expected? And how long will we have to wait?

Do we have the money and the heart to spend $5 million on such a study and come up with no real answers, no final data that can be used to make suggestions, seek solutions, take immediate action? After all, we are not dealing with some highly abstruse, scientific, technical matter. We are dealing with hungry children, under- and unnourished children whose whole lives are being affected right now by the lack of proper nutrient at a critical stage in their development, to say nothing of women of childbearing age who do not receive a proper diet, men whose work productivity is decreased by this same food deficiency.

Because I think this a most important and worthwhile effort to help eliminate malnutrition in this rich country, I am today introducing legislation expressing the sense of the House that the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should, not later than 60 days after the date on which the resolution is agreed upon, submit to the Congress the results of the national nutrition survey.

As early as January of 1969, Arnold E. Schaefer, chief of the nutrition program of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, estimated the extent of the starvation picture in this country and said that 16 to 17 percent of the persons examined were "real risks" and needed medical attention.

Margaret Mead, the famed sociologist has made this pertinent comment on the subject of hunger in the United States:

> Feeding the hungry yields precedence only to protection from the direst emergencies; flood, earthquake, radioactive and biological warfare. We cannot expect the citizenry of a country to respond to alarm signals about dying lakes and bays and deteriorating atmosphere—contamination and destruction for the world in which future generations must make their homes—if they are insensitive to the needs of hungry children today.

I hope that this body will fully and quickly endorse the resolution that I am introducing today. Along with Congressman JOHN SEIBERLING, I plan to reduce this bill in the coming weeks. I welcome your support. The question finally is: Are we to predestine the poor to a life of ill health and stunted ambition and ability while we talk about the importance of self-reliance and individual achievements? Or are we willing to publish and review the facts pertained in this national nutrition survey, and then act upon the same?

ALL THE NECESSARY DISQUALIFICATIONS

(Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the following column by Art Buchwald, which appeared in the June 10 Washington Post, contains more truth than poetry. I commend this column to the attention of the Members of this body, as we go into hearings on H.R. 34, "The Conversion Research and Education Act of 1971":

ALL THE NECESSARY DISQUALIFICATIONS

(By Art Buchwald)

VICE PRESIDENT OF DEVELOPMENT,
Glucksville Dynamics,
Glucksville, Calif.

DEAR SIR: I am writing in regard to employment with your firm. I have a B.S. from USC and Ph.D. in physics from the California Institute of Technology.

In my previous position I was in charge of research and development for the Harrington Chemical Company. We did work in thermonuclear energy, laser beam refraction, hydrogen molecule development and heavy water computer data.

Several of our research discoveries have been adapted for commercial use, and one particular breakthrough in linear hydraulics is now being used by every oil company in the country.

Because of a cutback in defense orders, the Harrington Company decided to shut down its research and development department. It is for this reason I am available for immediate employment.

Hoping to hear from you in the near future, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD KASE.

DEAR MR. KASE: We regret to inform you that we have no positions available for someone of your excellent qualifications. The truth of the matter is that we find you are "overqualified" for any position we might offer you in our organization. Thank you for thinking of us, and if anything comes up in the future, we will be getting in touch with you.

Yours truly,

MERRIMAN HASELBLAD,
Administrative Vice President.

PERSONNEL DIRECTOR,
Jessel International Systems,
Crewcut, Mich.

DEAR SIR: I am applying for a position with your company in any responsible capacity. I have had a college education and have fiddled around in research and development. Occasionally we have come up with some money-making ideas. I would be willing to start off at a minimal salary to prove my value to your firm.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD KASE.

DEAR MR. KASE: Thank you for your letter of the 15th. Unfortunately we have no positions at the moment for someone with a college education. Frankly it is the feeling of everyone here that you are "overqualified," and your experience indicates you would be much happier with a company that could make full use of your talents.

It was kind of you to think of us.

HARDY LANSDOWNE,
Personnel Department.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN,
Geis & Waterman, Inc.,
Ziegfried, Ill.

DERE SER: I'd like a job with your outfit. I can do anything you want me to. You name it Kase will do it. I ain't got no education and no experience, but I'm strong and I got moxy an I get along great with peeple. I'm ready to start any time because I need the bread. Let me known when you want me.

Cheers,

EDWARD KASE.

DEAR MR. KASE: You are just the person we have been looking for. We need a truck driver and your qualifications are perfect for us. You can begin working in our Westminister plant on Monday. Welcome aboard.

CARSON PETERS,
Personnel.

DEAUTHORIZATION PROCEDURE FOR OUTDATED CORPS PROJECTS

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, in my service on the Public Works Committee it has come to my attention that at this time there is no regularized procedure for annual review of public works projects which have been authorized but not constructed. Furthermore, there is no procedure other than legislation for deauthorization of projects which are no longer justified.

To remedy this situation I have introduced H.R. 8976, which would require that at least once each year the Chief of Engineers shall review all authorized public works projects, and shall submit a list of projects which are no longer justified to Congress. Projects on the list will automatically become deauthorized 60 days after submission of the list unless within that time either the House or Senate Committee on Public Works adopts a resolution stating that such project shall continue to be an authorized project.

The goal of this legislation is to provide a regular, statutory procedure for annual review of all pending, authorized projects to determine whether they continue to be justified. This review would include consideration of environmental factors as well as economic factors. Furthermore, this bill provides a regular procedure for automatic deauthorization of projects which are found to be no longer justified.

The major benefit from this bill, in addition to providing annual review of continued justification, is that it will clear a lot of deadwood from among projects which have been authorized for many years, often decades, but which have never been constructed. Now, even though everyone agrees that many of these projects are unwise, uneconomical and unjustified, they continue to be on the books as authorized. Paperwork has to be continually done by the Corps of Engineers, and the threat of the project hangs over the affected area like a Sword of Damocles. The property owners involved are never sure whether or not the project will be built, with the result that property values are depressed, regular maintenance often goes undone, and planning in the area is impossible. All of this needless effort and concern is expended because there is no regular procedure for deauthorization.

While it might be desirable for the Congress to give all these projects a thorough review, or to provide for deauthorization of all projects after a specified period of time, I think my proposal may be more realistic.

A BILL DEALING WITH SECONDARY BOYCOTTS, RECOGNITION PICKETING, AND JURISDICTIONAL STRIKES

(Mr. BETTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I have in-

troduced, for appropriate reference, a bill dealing with secondary boycotts, recognition picketing, and jurisdictional strikes.

Mr. Speaker, in this year 1971 we are at the end of an interesting 12-year cycle. Twelve years ago, in 1959, Congress amended our basic labor-management laws with passage of the Landrum-Griffin Act. Twelve years prior to Landrum-Griffin, Congress in 1947 made very substantial labor law changes with passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. The Taft-Hartley Act in turn came 12 years after enactment of the 1935 National Labor Relations Act, commonly known as the Wagner Act. I do not suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is any magic in the practice of tackling this important subject every 12 years. I do suggest, however, that as the calendar in 1971 brings the 12-year cycle to the fore once again, Congress and the American people may find as many conditions in need of correction as there were when earlier 12-year milestones were marked by the legislative action I have referred to.

Certainly as we review the history of labor-management relations, and of labor-management laws, few areas have commanded as much attention as those three areas covered by the bill I offer today—secondary boycotts, recognition picketing, and jurisdictional strikes. These three activities seem to me to have at least one significant point in common. Each one tends to injure innocent third parties—parties who are not directly involved in a labor dispute, and who seem to have no ready means of protecting themselves in the circumstances. For example, a secondary boycott can be coercion applied to a neutral who himself is not involved in a labor dispute, but who may be doing business with someone else who is engaged in a labor dispute. Recognition picketing, another form of coercion, is aimed at forcing an employer and his employees to accept a union those employees have not freely chosen. Jurisdictional strikes, born of squabbles between unions as to which union should do certain work, place the person who wants the work done in a helpless predicament; his operations are invariably forced to a halt by this kind of interunion dispute over which he has no practical control.

In all three of these important areas, Mr. Speaker, the law needs to be clarified. With respect to the boycott and picketing provisions, much of the correction is called for by the manner in which the National Labor Relations Board has administered those portions of the law. Regrettably, the Labor Board over the years has shown itself to be quite out of sympathy with the congressional purpose as set forth in the 1947 Taft-Hartley law and the 1959 Landrum-Griffin Act. And here, Mr. Speaker, I will not undertake any exhaustive analysis of the cases that bear upon these amendments. These can be more fully developed by public hearings which I trust will be scheduled soon. Suffice to say that from my point of view the NLRB has persisted in carving out loopholes in the congressional ban on boycotts and has been especially ingenious in devising evasions of the congressional ban on recognition picketing.

To illustrate, it seems fairly clear that Congress intended to ban all secondary boycotts. Yet, in the case of *NLRB* v. *Servette* (377 U.S. 46) we find the Board and the courts interpreting the law to permit secondary pressure when it is applied, not to "employees" but to management personnel. In another case, NLRB against Fruit and Vegetable Packers Local 760, the Supreme Court permitted secondary pressure on a neutral employer who operated a retail store—on the unrealistic theory that the boycott was not coercive of him, but instead was aimed at telling his customers that one of the products he sold was the subject of a labor dispute somewhere else. Another aspect of the Servette case corrected by this bill is the holding that a person who sells a product made by someone else can somehow be held to be the producer of that product. Over the years a number of landmark cases, among them *Plauche Electric, Inc.* (135 NLRB 250), have left the whole subject of common situs picketing in what seems to me a thoroughly confused state.

This amendment, Mr. Speaker, in five carefully devised limitations, will make certain that neutral employers will not be boycotted at a common job situs by picketing which is directed at the activities of another employer who is involved in a labor dispute. And finally, in the boycott area, Mr. Speaker, this bill will reverse a practice under which the NLRB and the courts—see *National Woodwork* and *Houston Insulation Contractors* (386 U.S. 612 and 386 U.S. 664)—have sanctioned secondary boycotting where the union contends it is merely "preserving work" for employees in a particular bargaining unit. This "preservation of work" theory has had a serious impact on the construction industry, and on costs within that industry, because it has sharply curtailed the use of prefabricated building materials.

Moving now to recognition picketing, Mr. Speaker, the bill I offer deals with two major loopholes in the law created by National Labor Relations Board decisions. The Landrum-Griffin Act made it an unfair labor practice to picket for recognition instead of resorting to the elections procedures set out in the statute. In a series of cases beginning with C. A. Blinne Construction Co. (135 NLRB 1153), the Board has failed to adhere to the law's requirement that an election petition be filed within 30 days after a union begins picketing at a nonunion plant. The second major picketing loophole, highlighted by the *Everett Construction Co.* case (136 NLRB 321), permits picketing where workers are not organized. The Board apparently justifies this kind of coersion on those employees and their employers by the novel ruling that the pickets are not really seeking union recognition but are only publicizing the fact that the plant is not unionized. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, these are conditions which call for corrective legislation.

The third area of this bill, Mr. Speaker, deals with jurisdictional strikes. In 1961, the Supreme Court in the so-called *C.B.S.* case (364 U.S. 473) ruled that unions could continue a jurisdictional dispute until the National Labor Relations Board conducted a hearing to determine which of the striking unions, as a matter of tradition and practice within the industry, should be permitted to do the work involved. Obviously, this brings no realistic relief in a situation where operations are shut down and the employer is faced with two unions—each contending its members should have been permitted to do the work involved.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, does not change that portion of the law which now declares that a jurisdictional strike is an unfair labor practice. It would, however, permit the same injunctive relief for that unfair labor practice as is provided now for secondary boycotts and recognition picketing. Further, it would relieve the NLRB of the time-consuming burden of determining which union should do the disputed work. Instead, it would restrict the NLRB to the more normal procedure of deciding whether the strike violated a Board order or certification. And the unions involved could protect their representation interests by using the law's established elections procedures.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated at the opening of my remarks, all the amendments in this bill are especially designed to bring meaningful protection to innocent third parties. Public interest and the cause of industrial peace will be well served by their prompt enactment into law.

PRESIDENT CAN LIMIT EXCESSIVE TEXTILE IMPORTS

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon can limit excessive textile imports. The President was granted this power under the national security clause of the Trade Extension Act of 1962. I urge President Nixon to invoke import quotas now. The President should invoke these quotas on a category-by-category basis and include manmade fibers and woolen and filament yarn.

The time has come for the President to act forthrightly and forcefully in the interest of fair trade in textiles. The President has been patient in seeking voluntary government-to-government agreements with Japan. I commend the President for this. The Japanese have delayed any meaningful agreement while frantically stepping up the level of exports to the United States. These textile exports from Japan have now reached flood proportions.

The President, as a candidate in 1968, realized the threat of excessive textile imports and promised relief for the hard-pressed textile industry and its 2½ million employees. The import situation then was a threat to the industry and its employees which prompted President Nixon to give this assurance. As a consequence in a very close election President Nixon carried key textile States, including Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina.

The situation today is much worse and is deteriorating rapidly. Almost daily we receive announcements of the closing down of yet another textile mill. Figures from the Department of Labor on textile mill employment in the Southeast showed a loss of 21,400 workers for the year. In April alone, North Carolina lost 600 workers, Georgia lost 900, and my own State of South Carolina lost 500. Between March and April, the workweek was shortened for the average textile employee and the gross average weekly earnings for the individual worker were down.

Mr. Speaker, the deteriorating textile situation, due to unfair textile imports, particularly from Japan, comes at the time when our Nation has reached the highest unemployment level in 9 years. The President does have the power to limit textile imports and he should act now to save the great textile industry of this country. It is vital for the President to act in the interest also of our national defense, for in this area textiles rank next to steel in importance. Our men all over the world are dependent on textiles as much as on guns. I urge the President to act now to alleviate the crushing problem of textile imports into this country.

COMMONSENSE AND BEMENT BRIDGE—A COMMENTARY ON OUR TIMES FROM BRADFORD, N.H.

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, in this day when multibillion-dollar programs are often critized as being inadequate, my weekly trips to my district often serve to lend perspective to my legislative duties. This was recently brought home to me by an article in New Hampshire Profiles describing how one New Hampshire town dealt with the problem of an old covered bridge which was in a state of disrepair.

As a background for this story, remember that late last year the Committee on Public Works, on which I serve, reported out the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970, which was subsequently enacted into law. A significant provision of this act was a new bridge replacement and reconstruction program, with authorizations of $250 million for the first 2 years. The reason for this new program, under which the Federal Government will pay 70 percent of the cost of reconstruction or replacement, is the recognition that across the country there are many thousands of major bridges which are obsolete and/or structurally deficient.

Recently, the town of Bradford, N.H., was faced with the need to replace or reconstruct a local bridge. As it happens that was a covered bridge which had been built in 1854 for $500. After a thorough examination of the alternatives, the least expensive way out for the town was found to be reconstruction, which cost $20,000.

The tale of Bement Bridge provides a timely and perceptive commentary on the wisdom of our multimillion- or billion-dollar programs. It suggests that many of our modern, extremely costly programs might not pass the test of commonsense—as indeed, the "modern structure of steel and concrete, complete with a sidewalk" did not pass the test of commonsense in Bradford, N.H.

I regret that it is not possible for the pictures with this article to appear in the RECORD, and also that it is not possible for all of the readers of this to come with me to see Bradford and the foothills of the White Mountains. It is a beautiful time of year in New Hampshire.

The story of Bement Bridge follows:

COMMONSENSE AND BEMENT BRIDGE

(By Stephen T. Whitney)

Oldtime Yankees are an obstinate lot. Or, at least, they enjoy making the world think so. They are fond of reminding those who will listen that life is not as good as it used to be (was it ever?) and bemoaning that men no longer build things as well as they used to. They are right, of course, but before they give up entirely, they should visit Bradford, New Hampshire.

At the edge of the village where the main highway sweeps across the sunny meadows bordering the Warner River, a country road crosses the river through a small covered bridge. It was not long ago that a traveler approaching the bridge was greeted by a sign whose simple legend mocked man's more sophisticated accomplishments:

BEMENT BRIDGE
Built 1854
Cost $500

Now there is a new sign. It includes a postscript in its greeting:

Rebuilt 1968–1969 Cost $20,000

Behind the sign, the bridge stands erect and proud, pleased with its tidy appearance.

It is quite likely that an old-timer would find support for his contentions in the sign's proclamations. He could point convincingly that the expense of the bridge's restoration was forty times greater than its original cost 115 years earlier and in so doing, imply that frugality was no longer fashionable. His conclusions would be hasty. Maybe *we* do not build things the way *they* used to but *we* can restore them. And Bradford's citizens are frugal.

Three late winters ago, the prospects for Bement Bridge were not lively. While attending to routine town business, Bradford's three selectmen passed through the bridge on their way to the Center. They noticed the little bridge had developed an appreciable cant during the winter and stopped for an impromptu inspection. Wading through settling snowdrifts to inspect its underpinings, the selectmen were dismayed to find that the ravages of time and the elements had taken their toll of the main timbers. The little bridge was having trouble supporting its own weight to say nothing of the burden of passing traffic.

By nightfall, two ominous yellow and black signs barred the approaches to the Bridge with the terse statement "Bridge Closed."

The next few days were busy ones for the selectmen. Everyone in Bradford wanted to know about the bridge's malaise and what the selectmen proposed to do about it. For some it was a matter of concern for an old neighbor. For others it was a matter of convenience. There was an adequate detour adding less than a mile to one's travels. But it was a *detour*.

From the beginning, it was apparent that repairs to Bement Bridge were beyond the budget and the resources of the Road Agent. In their quandary, the selectmen turned to the State's Bridge Division for help. Inspectors made an immediate survey and their report was not encouraging. The bridge had deteriorated far beyond the extent originally envisioned by the selectmen. Indicating that the bridge could not be repaired practically, their report suggested that the old covered bridge be replaced with a modern structure of steel and concrete, complete with a sidewalk. With the selectmen's consent, the Division's engineers prepared plans and estimates for such a bridge. The cost—$85,000.

Even with the help of State funds, the town's share of the expense would have placed a severe strain on the local budget. Within the town, reaction to the State's recommendation was predictable. Those inconvenienced by the closing of Bement Bridge supported the expenditure although reluctantly. Others, not affected by the circumstances, rallied to the position that the detour, which was not an extreme inconvience, should be made permanent and the bridge discontinued. Neither position was flexible.

There were citizens in Bradford who supported neither extreme. To many of these people, Bement Bridge was more than a matter of convenience or economy, it was the matter of a *covered* bridge.

The selectmen took the problem to the Bridge Division again, this time to look into the cost of repairing the existing bridge and to learn if the State would aid the town in the undertaking should it prove feasible. Although a wooden bridge made little sense to a modern highway engineer, it had the support of those concerned with the economic values of New Hampshire's heritage. It made a big difference to the people of Bradford. The Bridge Division prepared estimates for the restoration of Bement Bridge and agreed that the State would share the expense. The cost—$20,000.

The new proposal was the rallying point on which all of Bradford could agree. The town's share of the expense for saving Bement Bridge would be $7,000. At a special town meeting held in May, the townspeople approved unanimously the funds for the project, half of which would be drawn from current funds and half provided by borrowing.

Having moved so quickly on the restoration of Bement Bridge, the people of Bradford were not prepared for any delay in the work. But summer slipped by and so did the golden days of autumn. All the while, Bement Bridge stood as a forlorn reminder of a sad winter's day. But it was not the lack of money or interest that delayed the work. The State had only one crew to care for its covered bridges and there was work in the North Country to be completed before the work in Bradford could be started. It was a bleak day in late fall when the men and their equipment arrived in town.

Work on the bridge had scarcely been started before snow fell. To many, it seemed the men spent much of their time removing the snow that had fallen the day before and little on the actual work. Yet, by early spring, there were encouraging signs. Deep drifts of snow still banked the old stone abutments but above them the bridge's frame stood straight and true. Many of the old timbers were still in place. Where old timbers had been replaced, new ones had been carefully cut and shaped to take their place.

Later when spring flowers blossomed in the gentle warmth of the sun the people of Bradford once again could pass through Bement Bridge. A lot of water has passed under the bridge since it was first opened in 1854. One reflects on the possibility that some of Bradford's citizens of that bygone era were opposed to the expense of building the bridge. Even then, things were not what they used to be.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BUILDING SCIENCES

(Mr. MOORHEAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to reintroduce, with 20 cosponsors, my bill to establish a National Institute of Building Sciences; identical legislation was introduced with my original bill on May 13 by Senator JAVITS in the other body.

This legislation would establish a nongovernmental but Government-related institution designed to promote and develop cost-saving building techniques in the housing and construction industry.

For the first time, an authoritative technical institute would be available to coordinate the efforts of the many agencies, institutions, professional and trade groups now engaged in developing code standards and testing and evaluating new materials and methods.

Organized with the advice and assistance of the National Academy of Sciences-National Academy of Engineering Research Council, the NIBS Board of Directors will be broadly representative of various regions of the country and segments of the building community—industry, labor, all levels of government, technical experts, professional societies, and consumer interests.

The institute will carry on a specific and continuing program of cooperation—including the development of inservice training programs for building officials—with the States and political subdivisions designed to encourage changes in existing State and local laws that impede rather than facilitate modern construction techniques.

Initial Federal funding for the institute is proposed to be on a declining scale: $5 million for the first 2 years; $3 million for the next 2 years; and finally, $2 million, after which it will become self-sustaining through contracts, subscriptions, donations, and fees.

This concept has been endorsed by the President's Committee on Housing, American Institute of Architects, the Housing Producers Council, the American National Standards Institute, the Building Research Advisory Board, and the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

Hearings were held on a similar bill in the Senate last year; I am hopeful that my Committee on Banking and Currency will seriously consider this improved language designed to achieve a more rational building system in the United States in this session of Congress.

Several Members have agreed to cosponsor this legislation, and I include their names in the RECORD: Messrs. ADDABBO, BINGHAM, BROWN of Michigan, CONYERS, DENT, DIGGS, FRASER, KOCH, HECHLER of West Virginia, LEGGETT, MATSUNAGA, MIKVA, PEPPER, PODELL, QUIE, REES, RODINO, ROSENTHAL, RYAN, and Mrs. SULLIVAN.

Text of the bill follows:

H.R. 9058

A bill to amend the House and Urban Development Act of 1970 to provide a more effective approach to the problem of developing and maintaining a rational relationship between building codes and related regulatory requirements and building technology in the United States, and to facilitate urgently needed cost-saving innovations in the building industry, through the establishment of an appropriate nongovernmental instrument which can make definitive technical findings, insure that the findings are made available to all sectors of the economy, public and private, and provide an effective method for encouraging and facilitating Federal, State, and local acceptance and use of such findings

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE X—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BUILDING SCIENCES

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 1001. This title may be cited as the 'Building Sciences Act of 1971'.

"FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 1002. (a) The Congress finds: (1) that the lack of an authoritative national source to make findings and to advise both the public and private sectors of the economy with respect to the use of building science and technology in achieving nationally acceptable standards and other technical provision for use in Federal, State, and local housing and building regulations is an obstacle to efforts by and imposes severe burdens upon all those who procure, design, construct, use, operate, maintain, and retire physical facilities, and frequently results in the failure to take full advantage of new and useful developments in technology which could improve our living environment; (2) that the establishment of model building codes or of a single national building code will not completely resolve the problem because of the difficulty at all levels of government in updating their housing and building regulations to reflect new developments in technology, as well as the irregularities and inconsistencies which arise in applying such requirements to particular localities or special local conditions; (3) that the lack of uniform housing and building regulatory provisions increases the cost of construction and thereby reduces the amount of housing and other community facilities which can be provided; and (4) that the existence of a single authoritative nationally recognized institution to provide for the evaluation of new technology for the purpose of updating housing and building regulatory provisions could facilitate introduction of such innovations and their acceptance at the Federal, State, and local levels.

"(b) The Congress further finds, however, that while no authoritative source of technical findings is needed, various private organizations and institutions, private industry, labor, and Federal and other governmental agencies and entities are presently engaged in building research, technology development, testing and evaluation, standards and model code development and promulgation, and information dissemination. These existing activities should be encouraged and these capabilities effectively utilized wherever possible and appropriate to the purposes of this Act.

"(c) The Congress declares that an authoritative no-governmenal instruments needs to be created to address the problems and issues described in subsection (a), that the creation of such an instrument should be initiated by the Government, with the advice and assistance of the National Academy of Sciences-National Academy of Engineering-National Research Council (hereinafter referred to as the 'Academies-Research Council') and with the greatest practicable participation of representatives of the various sectors of the building community, including labor and management, technical experts in building science and technology, and the various levels of government.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF INSTITUTE

"SEC. 1003. (a) There is authorized to be established, for the purposes described in section 1002, an appropriate nonprofit, nongovernmental instrument to be known as the 'National Institute of Building Sciences' (hereinafter referred to as the 'institute'), which shall not be an agency or establishment of the United States Government. The institute shall be subject to the provisions of this title and, to the extent consistent with this title, to a charter of the Congress if such a charter is requested and issued or to the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act if that is deemed preferable.

"(b) The Academies-Research Council shall advise and assist in (1) the establishment of the institute and its operation during its first five years of existence; (2) the development of an organizational framework to encourage and provide for the maximum participation feasible of public and private scientific, technical, and financial organizations, in situations, and agencies now engaged in activities pertinent to the development, promulgation, and maintenance of performance criteria, standards, and other technical provisions for building codes and other regulations; and (3) the promulgation of appropriate organizational rules and procedures including those for the selection and operation of a technical staff, such rules and procedures to be based upon the primary object of promoting the public interest and insuring that the widest possible variety of interests and experience essential to the functions of the institute are represented in the institute's operations. Recommendations of the Academies-Research Council shall be based upon consultations with and recommendations from various private organizations and institutions, laobr, private industry, governmental agencies and entities operating in the field, and the Consultative Council as provided for under section 1004(h).

"(c) Nothing in this title shall be construed as expressing the intent of the Congress that the Academies-Research Council itself be required to assume any function or operation vested in the institute by or under this title, nor is its continuing advice and assistance precluded should the institute and the Academies-Research Council wish to provide therefor beyond the initial five years of operation.

"ADMINISTRATION OF THE INSTITUTE

"SEC. 1004. (a) The institute shall have a board of directors (hereinafter referred to as the 'board') consisting of not less than fifteen nor more than twenty-one members, appointed during its first five years of operation by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and thereafter as provided for by its charter. In selecting persons to serve on the initial board, the President shall appoint members from lists of highly qualified persons recommended to him by the Academies-Research Council. The board shall be reasonably representative of the various regions of the country of the various segments of the building community including private industry and labor, of all levels of government, of consumer interests, and of the various types of experience which are appropriate to the functions and responsibilities of the institute.

"(b) The members of the initial board shall serve as incorporators and shall take whatever actions are necessary to establish

the institute as provided for under section 1002(a).

"(c) The term of office of each member of the initial and succeeding Boards shall be three years; except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of office of members first taking office shall begin on the date of incorporation and shall expire, as designated at the time of their appointment, one-third at the end of one year, one-third at the end of two years, and one-third at the end of three years. No member shall be eligible to serve in excess of three consecutive terms of three years each. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this subsection, a member whose term has expired may serve until his successor has qualified.

"(d) Any vacancy in the initial and succeeding boards shall not affect its power, but shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointments were made, or, after the first five years of operation, as provided for by the organizational rules and procedures of the institute.

"(e) The President shall designate one of the members appointed to the initial board as Chairman; thereafter, the members of the initial and succeeding boards shall annually elect one of their number as Chairman. The members of the board shall also elect one or more of their number as Vice Chairman. Terms of the Chairman and Vice Chairman shall be for one year and no individual shall serve as Chairman or Vice Chairman for more than two consecutive terms.

"(f) The members of the initial or succeeding boards shall not, by reason of such membership, be deemed to be employees of the United States Government. They shall, while attending meetings of the board or while engaged in duties related to such meetings or in other activities of the board pursuant to this title, be entitled to receive compensation at the rate of $100 per day including travel-time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, equal to that authorized by law (section 5703 of title 5, United States Code) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(g) The institute shall have a president and such other executive officers and employees as may be appointed by the board at rates of compensation fixed by the board. No such executive officer or employee may receive any salary or other compensation from any source other than the institute during the period of his employment by the institute.

"(h) The institute shall establish, with the advice and assistance of the Academies-Research Council, a consultative council, membership in which shall be available to a representative of all appropriate private trade, professional, and labor organizations, private and public standards, code, and testing bodies, public regulatory agencies, and consumer groups, so as to insure a direct line of communication between such groups and the institute and a vehicle for representative hearings on matters before the institute.

"NONPROFIT AND NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF THE INSTITUTE

"SEC. 1005. (a) The institute shall have no power to issue any shares of stock, or to declare or pay any dividends.

"(b) No part of the income or assets of the institute shall inure to the benefit of any director, officer, employee, or any other individual except as salary or reasonable compensation for services.

"(c) The institute shall not contribute to or otherwise support any political party or candidate for elective public office.

"FUNCTIONS OF THE INSTITUTE

"SEC. 1006. (a) The institute shall exercise its functions and responsibilities in four general areas relating to building regulation, as follows:

"(1) Development, promulgation, and maintenance of nationally recognized performance criteria, standards, and other technical provisions for maintenance of life, safety, health, and public welfare suitable for adoption by building regulating jurisdictions and agencies, including test methods and other evaluative techniques relating to building systems, subsystems, components, products, and materials.

"(2) Evaluation and prequalification of existing and new building technology in accordance with paragraph (1).

"(3) Conduct of needed investigations in direct support of paragraphs (1) and (2).

"(4) Assembly, storage, and dissemination of technical data and other information directly related to paragraphs (1), (2), and (3).

"(b) The institute in exercising its functions and responsibilities described in subsection (a) shall assign and delegate, to the maximum extent possible, responsibility for conducting each of the needed activities described in subsection (a) to one or more of the private organizations, institutions, agencies, and Federal and governmental entities with a capacity to exercise or contribute to the exercise of such responsibility, monitor the performance achieved through assignment and delegation, and, when deemed necessary, reassign and delegate such responsibility.

"(c) The institute in exercising its functions and responsibilities under subsections (a) and (b) shall (1) give particular attention to the development of methods for encouraging all sectors of the economy to cooperate with the institute and to accept and use its technical findings, and to accept and use the nationally recognized performance criteria, standards, and other technical provisions developed for use in Federal, State, and local building codes and other regulations which result from the program of the institute; (2) to seek to assure that its actions are coordinated with related requirements which are imposed in connection with community and environmental development generally; and (3) consult with the Department of Justice and other agencies of Government to the extent necessary to insure that the national interest is protected and promoted in the exercise of its functions and responsibilities.

"FINANCING OF THE INSTITUTE'S ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 1007. (a) The institute is authorized to accept contracts and grants from Federal, State, and local governmental agencies and other entities, and grants and donations from private organizations, institutions, and individuals.

"(b) The institute may, in accordance with rates and schedules established with guidance provided by the Academies-Research Council under section 1003(b), establish fees and other charges for services provided by the institute or under its authorization.

"(c) Amounts received by the institute under this section shall be in addition to any amounts which may be appropriated to provide its initial operating capital under section 1009.

"COOPERATION BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES

"SEC. 1008. (a) Every department, agency, and establishment of the Federal Government, in carrying out any building or construction, or any building- or construction-related program, which involves direct expenditures, and in developing technical requirements for any such building or construction, shall be required to accept the technical findings of the institute, or any nationally recognized performance criteria, standards, and other technical provisions for building regulations brought about by the institute, which may be applicable.

"(b) All projects and programs involving Federal assistance in the form of loans, grants, guarantees, insurance, or technical aid, or in any other form, shall, as a condition of the assistance, accept, use, and comply with any of the technical findings of the institute, or any nationally recognized performance criteria, standards, and other technical provisions for building codes and other regulations brought about by the institute, which may be applicable to the purposes for which the assistance is to be used.

"(c) Every department, agency, and establishment of the Federal Government having responsibility for building or construction, or for building- or construction-related programs, is authorized and encouraged to request authorization and appropriations for grants to the institute for its general support, and is authorized to contract with and accept contracts from the institute for specific services where deemed appropriate by the responsible Federal official involved.

"(d) The institute shall establish and carry on a specific and continuing program of cooperation with the States and their political subdivisions designed to encourage their acceptance and its technical findings and of nationally recognized performance criteria, standards, and other technical provisions for building regulations brought about by the institute. Such program shall include (1) efforts to encourage changes in existing State and local law to utilize or embody such findings and regulatory provisions; and (2) assistance to States in the development of inservice training programs for building officials and in the establishment of fully staffed and qualified State technical agencies to advise local officials on questions of technical interpretation.

"APPROPRIATIONS FOR INITIAL CAPITAL

"SEC. 1009. There is authorized to be appropriated to the institute, over the first five fiscal years which end after the date of the enactment of this title, the sum of $5,000,000 for each of the first two such fiscal years, the sum of $3,000,000 for each of the next two such fiscal years, and the sum of $2,000,000 for the last such fiscal year (with each appropriation to be available until expended or until six years shall have passed), to be used to provide the institute with initial capital adequate for the exercise of its functions and responsibilities during such years (and to assist the Academies-Research Council with funds under contract which the Board may deem necessary to allow the Council to provide the necessary advice and assistance in organizing and establishing the institute); and thereafter the institute shall be financially self-sustaining through the means described in section 1007.

"REPORT TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 1010. The institute shall submit an annual report for the preceding fiscal year to the President for transmittal to the Congress within sixty days of its receipt. The report shall include a comprehensive and detailed report of the institute's operations, activities, financial condition, and accomplishments under this Act and may include such recommendations as the institute deems appropriate. Each such report shall include a separate report from the Academies-Research Council."

HUNGER—A FORGOTTEN PROBLEM

(Mr. SEIBERLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution to require the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to release the complete results of the national nutrition survey.

An identical resolution has been introduced in the Senate by Senator ERNEST HOLLINGS of South Carolina who deserves much of the credit for focusing national attention on the scandal of hunger in America.

The saga behind the National Nutrition Survey is one that is repeated all too often in official Washington. It is the story of how the leaders of Government react to many of the major social crises of the day—in this case the revelation in 1967 that there was widespread hunger and malnutrition, and even starvation, in the United States.

First comes the appointment of a commission or study group to look into the problem, then the outlay of millions of dollars to carry out the study, and finally repression or rejection of the final results when they prove to be too embarrassing to the administration in power.

This pattern has been repeated time and again in the past several years. There was the Kerner Commission on race riots whose dire warnings about the creation of two separate societies, one black and one white, were simply not believed by the Johnson administration; then the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence led by Dr. Milton Eisenhower whose findings were largely ignored; and the Scranton Commission on Campus Violence which has been denounced and rejected by members of the administration which commissioned it.

Most recently, there was the famous Garwin report—a study of the SST prepared for the President's Science Advisory Committee which the administration refused to release when it turned out to be critical of the SST.

The National Nutrition Survey was authorized by the Congress in the summer of 1967 when the issue of hunger in America finally surfaced. The initial reaction was one of shock and disbelief. Government agencies responded with emergency grants to feed the poor and critical analyses of their own food programs, citizens inquiry groups were organized to investigate hunger, and the Surgeon General of the United States testified before a Senate subcommittee that:

> We do not know the extent of malnutrition anywhere in the United States. I cannot say what the extent is because we just don't know.
>
> It hasn't been anybody's job to find out. We can do it all over the world, but not in the United States.

The Congress responded to this appalling testimony by passing an amendment requiring the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make a comprehensive survey of the incidence and location of serious hunger and malnutrition and health problems incident thereto and report these findings within 6 months to the Congress.

The national nutrition survey was launched in 1968. Ten States were chosen for the survey—Texas, Louisiana, New York, Kentucky, Michigan, California, Washington, South Carolina, West Virginia, and Massachusetts.

Doctors and health officials from the Federal Government and the States were brought together to conduct the survey.

Seventy thousand people in the 10 States received thorough medical examinations and the data was put on 3 million punchcards.

Five million dollars was spent.

Eighty percent of the information on the individual exams has been audited, and is complete.

Yet today, those cards, containing the only comprehensive data on the incidence of hunger and malnutrition and related health problems of the poor in America, are stored in boxes in the Center for Disease Control in Atlanta, Ga.—unavailable to the Congress and to the public.

Dr. Arnold Schaefer, the project director and Public Health Service staff member for 15 years, has said that the survey results can be projected to show that there are 15 million hard-core hungry and malnourished people in the United States.

The survey also proves that two out of five persons below the poverty level have serious medical problems caused by malnutrition.

Put these statistics alongside the recent scientific findings about the damaging effects of malnutrition on the intelligence, not only of living children but of those not yet born and not even conceived, and you begin to see that this is not only an immense tragedy but a self-perpetuating crisis. Unless the vicious circle is broken with outside help, these victims will be unable to sustain themselves and will be the source of an unending burden on the rest of the Nation.

The survey results are shocking. And they say a lot about the shortcomings of our society. Perhaps for that very reason many people choose not to believe them.

The administration has, in fact, been critical of the national nutrition survey and has questioned its scientific validity. Yet the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Academy of Sciences reports that the data is valid.

For whatever reason, this administration is obviously uncomfortable with the results of the survey and refuses to release the completed data. Instead, they have furnished a totally inadequate interim report, and have called for a new nutrition study to last through 1973.

And so the cycle begins again.

Four years ago the Congress authorized the national nutrition survey in response to the national scandal of hunger in America. Now we have collected the necessary data on which to formulate badly needed programs to correct this scandal.

If we wait 2 more years, until the administration has completed yet another survey, the problem will, of course, only have worsened.

We are a long way from fulfilling the promises of the 1960's to end poverty and hunger in America. But this survey gives us the necessary information to make good on some of those promises.

The Congress must demand that the survey be released, and then get on with the business of assuring adequate nutrition for all Americans.

The text of the resolution follows:

H. RES. 476

Whereas, the Congress of the United States in 1967 issued a mandate to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to make a comprehensive survey of the incidence and location of serious hunger and malnutrition and health problems incident thereto in the United States; and

Whereas, the Nutrition Program of the United States Public Health Service was designated by the Secretary to plan, develop and carry out the mandate; and

Whereas, Dr. Arnold E. Schaefer, Chief of the Nutrition Program, National Center for Chronic Disease Control, Bureau of Disease Prevention and Environmental Control, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, was placed in charge of the National Nutrition Survey; and

Whereas, Dr. Schaefer and his team of experts, using methodology devised in 33 international surveys since 1956, did conduct the National Nutrition Survey in the states of Texas, Louisiana, New York, Kentucky, Michigan, Massachusetts, California, Washington, West Virginia, and South Carolina; and

Whereas, the National Nutrition Survey has been completed with the examination of more than seventy thousand persons at a cost in excess of $5 million, and has produced data approved as valid by the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Academy of Sciences; and

Whereas, official results have been produced on only two states, Texas and Louisiana, in April, 1970, but no other results have been forthcoming, despite the fact that the raw data is available to be fed into computers for results; and

Whereas, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has announced plans to undertake a contining "probability survey" without reporting on or implementing any findings of the National Nutrition Survey, but has yet to examine the first patient; therefore be it

Resolved, that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare should, not later than 60 days after the date on which this resolution is agreed to, submit to the Congress the results of the comprehensive survey, required by Section 14 of the Partnership for Health Amendments Act of 1967, of the incidence and location of serious hunger and malnutrition and health problems incident thereto in the United States, together with his findings and recommendations with respect thereto.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION AMENDMENTS

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced H.R. 8395, "The Rehabilitation Act of 1971," which amends and updates the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. Twenty-three members of the House Committee on Education and Labor have joined me in sponsoring this legislation. The sponsors include Members of both parties, which is indicative

of the bipartisan support vocational rehabilitation has always had and will have this year, I am sure. It is my hope that hearings will be conducted soon, and that action on the legislation will be completed this year. It is important that it be accomplished this year, as authorizations of appropriations for all titles of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act expire June 30, 1972.

During 1970, the State-Federal program of vocational rehabilitation, which operates under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, celebrated its 50th anniversary, and ceremonies were held nationally and in all of the States. During the life of the program, over 2,800,000 physically and mentally handicapped people have been assisted in rehabilitating themselves, and many of these individuals occupy prominent positions in American life today. In almost every audience which includes handicapped individuals, when rehabilitation is discussed, people rise to state how much it meant to have the resources of a rehabilitation agency available at a crucial time in their lives.

In 1968, a National Citizens' Advisory Committee on Vocational Rehabilitation, appointed at the request of the House Appropriations Committee, made its report to Congress and to the Nation. I should like to show with my colleague two quotations from the report. The Advisory Committee stated:

> We are convinced that the rehabilitation movement in the United States represents one of the great achievements of our culture. It stands as a monument to the humanitarian instincts of the American citizen, and, at the same time, provides practical ways for disabled persons to achieve satisfying, productive lives.

Again, referring specifically to a study of the State-Federal vocational rehabilitation program, the Advisory Committee continued:

> We liked what we saw when we looked at the public vocational rehabilitation program. There can be no doubt of the program's success. From the time of its inception in 1920—the program has been the literal salvation of millions of disabled Americans. Evidence of its success is seen in the constantly increasing numbers of the disabled who are rehabilitated each year, in the economic gain resulting from the investment of the American dollar, and in the extent to which other governmental programs have adopted rehabilitation ideas, techniques and methods.

The committee also listed four major components of the rehabilitation program which are important to its development: direct services to individuals, research and demonstration, training of personnel, and the construction of rehabilitation facilities. These components reinforce each other and assure a steady progress in both the numbers of people served and in the effectiveness of the services which are provided. All four components are provided for in the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

A few of the facts about the present status of the program are appropriate at this point. The State-Federal rehabilitation program serves all classes of handicapped people. In fiscal 1970, it expended a total of $557,706,000 in rehabilitating 266,975 handicapped individuals. The total number of people receiving services during that year was 875,911. The average cost of each rehabilitated case was slightly more than $2,000, which includes all administrative expense and all expenditures for individuals who were served during the year, whether or not the services resulted in rehabilitation. The program also has the highest cost-effectiveness ratio of any federally supported program with similar objectives.

Fortunately, the vocational rehabilitation program has been characterized by its pioneering spirit and by the flexibility of its operation. Having the authority under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to serve any class of handicapped individuals who needs services and to provide almost any services that may be needed by an individual, if such services will result in his rehabilitation, State agencies have been able to move promptly and effectively into new areas of service. Persons rehabilitated in 1970, in addition to the orthopedically handicapped whose disabilities are more obvious, included substantial numbers of the mentally ill, the mentally retarded, public offenders, narcotic addicts, and alcoholics.

Rehabilitation programs have also tried to bring their services to handicapped individuals in a variety of settings. These agencies are working closely with the public schools, mental hospitals, residential schools for the retarded, correctional institutions, and many other organizations in efforts to bring rehabilitation emphasis into their programs. Their influence has been felt not only in the number of persons referred by these agencies who have received rehabilitation services but also in the adoption by the various agencies of the rehabilitation philosophy, which has vitally affected their entire operations.

Vocational rehabilitation agencies could not have succeeded in their efforts without the wholehearted cooperation of voluntary agencies organized to help handicapped people. State allotments under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act have been used liberally by the States to establish and equip rehabilitation facilities, most of which are operated by voluntary agencies. The State vocational rehabilitation agencies, then, purchase services from the community-based facilities. Research and demonstration grants are made by the Secretary under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of both public and voluntary agencies, and the voluntary agencies are often the pioneers in new developments.

It often has been stated that the vocational rehabilitation movement has developed the best blend of public and voluntary organization services and the most effective working relationships of any program in the field of human services.

Notable, too, has been the fine relationships between the States and the Federal Government in the administration of this program. The Federal administration has been understanding of principles that must underlie effective State-Federal relationships, and the States have readily accepted administrative and technical leadership from Federal personnel. Both the States and the Federal Government point to this program as an example of a good State-Federal relationship.

While commending the efforts of the vocational rehabilitation agencies, the National Citizens' Committee on Vocational Rehabilitation, as well as many other bodies, have carefully pointed out its inadequacies. A relatively small percentage of the people who could be substantially helped by rehabilitation services actually receive such services. In some instances, this is because of a lack of understanding of what rehabilitation is and what these agencies can do. In the main, it is because of an inadequacy of resources. In H.R. 8395 an effort has been made to identify weaknesses and to suggest program that will overcome such inadequacies. At the conclusion of this statement, I shall insert a brief section-by-section analysis of the bill. At this point, I would like to discuss briefly the principal features and objectives of H.R. 8395.

First, it extends appropriation authority for all titles of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act for 3 years.

Second, it establishes a program of grants to the States to assist them in initiating or expanding services to classes of handicapped individuals which have unusual difficult problems in connection with their rehabilitation. Expected to profit from this title are alcoholics, drug addicts, migratory workers, public offenders, and others.

Third, the bill sets up special programs for the deaf and for the blind which will round out comprehensive services to these two groups of severely handicapped individuals.

Fourth, it authorizes the establishment of special centers for the low-achieving deaf.

Fifth, it establishes in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Information and Resource Center for handicapped individuals.

Sixth, it authorizes the establishment of a National Commission on Transportation and Housing for the handicapped which would operate along the lines of the very successful National Commission on Architectural Barriers.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have been associated with vocational rehabilitation legislation in the past. This program has never let us down. I know the Kentucky program intimately and have witnessed its profound impact on the lives of handicapped people in my own district. I firmly believe that an expanded program is now in order, and that any additional responsibilities given to the State-Federal program of rehabilitation under this legislation will be met diligently. I am sure we will not be disappointed with the results.

The analysis of the bill follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 8395

SECTION 1. This section contains the title of the act, a brief statement of purpose, and a table of contents.

SEC. 2. This section contains a statement of findings and purpose. The present act lacks a clear and comprehensive statement of this kind. The statement is written so as to relate to the various programs provided for in the bill.

SEC. 3. This section contains provisions for advanced funding to prevent a situation in which a program has to operate on the basis of continuing resolutions, when an appropriation bill is not passed by June 30. Advanced funding will make possible better planning and more effective use of funds appropriated. The advanced funding language in the bill is similar to that found in the manpower legislation sent to Congress by the Administration.

SEC. 4. This section permits agencies financed under the act to enter into joint funding relationships with other agencies receiving Federal funds. In such a project, one of the agencies could be given responsibility for administering the funds of all the agencies involved in financing the project. A single Federal share could prevail for all the funds going into the project. This provision will permit effective joint funding and administration of programs. The language in the present Vocational Rehabilitation Act having to do with joint funding has been found to be inadequate.

SEC. 5. This section permits a state to submit a consolidated state plan to cover all or part of the titles of this act and the Developmental Disabilities Services and Construction Act of 1970. Since this latter Act is administered by the Rehabilitation Services Administration and is closely related to rehabilitation programs in the States, it is felt that this program should be included among those with respect to which it is possible to include in a consolidated plan.

The provisions governing such consolidated plans are those generally in effect for State plans at this time. A single average Federal share for the programs covered by the consolidated State plan may be established by the Secretary on request of the Governor of the State. Not to exceed 10% of the appropriations for any one program may be transferred to another program.

SEC. 6. There is nothing new in the definitions in this part of the bill.

TITLE I. VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES

The provisions of this title pertain to two grant-in-aid programs, the basic State-Federal vocational rehabilitation program financed at the present time under section 2, and a new grant-in-aid program for initiation and expansion of rehabilitation programs, which includes some of the provisions of the present section 4 with additional programs added.

SEC. 100. This section contains a declaration of purpose. The section is new, present legislation having no comprehensive statement of purpose for the State-Federal vocational rehabilitation program.

SEC. 101. This section contains the authorizations for appropriations for the basic State-Federal vocational rehabilitation program and for the new initiation and expansion program. Appropriation authority is for three years, ending June 30, 1975.

SEC. 102. This section contains the allotment formula for the basic State-Federal vocational rehabilitation program. Allotments will continue to be made based upon population and per capita income (allotment percentage) squared. A minimum allotment to a State will be $2 million per annum or an amount specified in the annual appropriation bill. This method of adjusting minimum allotments is similar to that provided for in section 3 and section 15 of the present Vocational Rehabilitation Act. Private funds may be used as State funds to match Federal funds for construction and establishment of a rehabilitation facility, subject to regulations of the Secretary. This is a continuation of the so-called Laird amendment language.

SEC. 103. This section sets up a program of grants to the States to assist them in developing and carrying out special programs to initiate or expand services to classes of handicapped individuals which have unusually difficult problems in connection with their rehabilitation and responsibility for whose treatment, education, and rehabilitation is shared by the State vocational rehabilitation agency with other agencies. The classes of handicapped individuals referred to include alcoholics, drug addicts, migratory workers, and public offenders. This section also incorporates the expansion grant authority in section 4 of the present Act.

Funds will be allotted to States on the basis of population alone. States will develop projects which will be submitted to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for approval. If a State does not use all of its allotment, the unused part of the allotment can be reallotted to another State. A 90 per centum Federal share will prevail in this program. Any one project developed under the program would be limited to three years.

This program is designed to enable the States to make a massive attack upon some of the most important problems of our day in connection with handicapping conditions. The vocational rehabilitation agencies have demonstrated an ability to work effectively with the classes of handicapped invididuals mentioned in this section, but the lack of resources has prevented their movement in a substantial way.

SEC. 104. This section contains State plan provisions governing the State-Federal grant-in-aid program. There are two principal changes from existing plan provisions.

(1) Administration of the vocational rehabilitation program by a local service agency, under State supervision, is permitted. This replaces the provision found in existing law which has not been used. It would put the vocational rehabilitation agency in position to cooperate with other agencies which move toward local administration. When a program is administered locally, there must be a local advisory committee which will advise the local organization on program development and related matters, evaluate the effectiveness of local programs, and submit its findings and recommendations to the State agency supervising the administration of the program.

(2) The list of State agencies with which the State vocational rehabilitation agency must have cooperative arrangements is updated to include public assistance and social service agencies, manpower agencies, programs for the deaf and the blind, and others.

SEC. 105. This section includes the definitions governing the Federal grant-in-aid rehabilitation programs. The changes are as follows:

(1) In the definition of rehabilitation services, the term "advocacy" is added as a service. This means advocacy in the sense that the agency will be responsible for serving the handicapped individual or for seeing that he gets the service he needs. It also implies the identification of gaps in the service structure and the alerting of the community and the State with respect to the need for new programs and for expanded programs.

(2) The definition of rehabilitation services is also amended to include "follow along and other post-employment services necessary" to assist handicapped people to maintain their employment. This is to emphasize the fact that some handicapped people must not be "closed" when employed but must be given post-employment services for an indefinite period of time.

(3) The definition of the handicapped individual is revised to include the words "including a behavioral disorder". These words are already in the regulations. Having them in the law will emphasize the congressional intent that persons suffering serious behavioral disorders but who may not possess medically diagnosable physical or mental impairments are to be served. It also states separately the criteria for determining that an individual is handicapped in order to recognize, as the regulations do, that various factors (medical, psychological, vocational, educational, cultural, social, environmental) may, combined with disability, affect a handicap to employment.

(4) The Secretary is given authority to designate by regulations certain classes of individuals who meet the first two criteria used to identify the handicapped individual, that is, (1) he is under a disability, and (2) has an employment handicap. The application of the third criteria, that the person can reasonably be expected to benefit from vocational rehabilitation services, is a professional responsibility based upon an evaluation of the individual's rehabilitation potential and will be applied by vocational rehabilitation agency personnel.

(5) The terms "local service agency" and "local advisory committees" are defined.

TITLE II, EVALUATION OF REHABILITATION POTENTIAL

This title is the same as Section 15 of the present Vocational Rehabilitation Act, "Evaluation of Rehabilitation Potential", with two exceptions.

(1) Section 202(a) clearly mandates allotments to States be made on the basis of amounts authorized in law, and

(2) In a State with more than one agency administering the vocational rehabilitation program, the State may apportion its allotment between the agencies. This permits participation in the program by State agencies providing vocational rehabilitation to the blind.

TITLE III—SENSORY DISABILITIES

This title has two parts, Part A, which has to do with services to the blind, and Part B, which has to do with services to the deaf. Implicit in this title is the fact that blind and visually handicapped people and deaf and hearing impaired people have unusually difficult problems in adjusting to their disabilities and achieving independence and self-support. It is an acknowledgment that vocational rehabilitation services, routinely applied, may not be adequate in serving these two groups of severely handicapped individuals. Further, it is recognized that the deaf and blind require a broader range of services provided under a broader range of conditions than do most groups of handicapped individuals. This title is expected to make it possible for the agencies rehabilitating these two groups of disabled individuals to do literally anything and everything that is required in order to help them achieve the maximum degree of independence and self-support.

PART A—SERVICES FOR THE BLIND

SEC. 300. This section contains a statement of purpose.

SEC. 301. This section authorizes appropriations for services to the blind.

SEC. 302. This section provides for allotments to the states based on population and per capita income (allotment percentage) with minimum allotments of $50,000 per annum to a state. It also provides that a state may apportion its allotment between agencies, when more than one agency is involved in the administration of its programs for the blind. There is also a reallotment provision to be used, if one state is unable to use all of its allotment. Ten per cent of the appropriations may be retained by the Secretary to pay 90% of the cost of projects of national significance which will contribute to or demonstrate new and improved methods for the rehabilitation of the blind.

SEC. 303. This section contains the state plan requirements. They are similar to those found in the Developmental Disabilities Services and Construction Act.

SEC. 305. Definitions. A few of the definitions are significant.

(1) A blind or visually handicapped person

is defined to mean a person who is blind or visually handicapped according to the state law and may include individuals who, in addition to their visual impairments, have other disabilities.

(2) The definition of services to the blind and visually handicapped is written so as to include any service that may be required to help such an individual adjust to his blindness and live an independent, and, so far as possible, a productive life. It will encourage serving blind older people and children usually considered too young for vocational rehabilitation services.

(3) The definition of services includes the establishment and maintaining of a register of the blind and the establishment and maintaining of centers for collecting and distributing materials necessary in serving the blind.

(4) The definitions are carefully written to permit the agencies to do anything that visually handicapped persons need to have done that is not available from other agencies, while assuring a non-duplication of effort. It will be noted that there is a special section dealing with non-duplication.

PART B—SERVICES FOR THE DEAF

SEC. 310. This section contains a statement of purpose.

SEC. 311. This section authorizes appropriations for services to the deaf.

SEC. 312. This section contains allotment provisions. Appropriations are to be allotted upon the basis of population and per capita income (allotment percentage), with a $50,000 annual minimum allocation. This section also includes a reallotment provision. Ten per cent of the appropriation may be retained by the Secretary of HEW for projects of national significance that will assist in meeting the needs of the deaf or demonstrating new or improved techniques for serving such persons.

SEC. 313. This section includes state plan provisions. They are similar to those in the Developmental Disabilities Services and Construction Act.

SEC. 315. There are several important definitions.

(1) The terms "deaf" and "deafness" are to be defined in regulations of the Secretary and may include individuals who, in addition to being deaf, have other disabilities.

(2) The term "services to deaf" is defined broadly to include any services that may be needed by the individual to enable him to become more independent and productive.

(3) The definition of "services" includes authority to establish and maintain a register of the deaf.

(4) There is a provision to prevent any duplication of services with those provided by any other agency.

TITLE IV—SPECIAL FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITIES

In the present Vocational Rehabilitation Act, the responsibilities of the federal government are scattered throughout the legislation. In this title, all of the federal responsibilities have been brought together and some additional responsibilities included.

SEC. 400. This section contains a declaration of purpose and listing of programs which are the responsibility of the Secretary.

SEC. 401. This section contains authorizations for appropriations for the programs listed in the previous section. It also includes authorization of appropriations of not to exceed $1 million to be used by the Secretary for the evaluation of the programs authorized by the act.

SEC. 402. This section includes the authority needed by the Secretary to administer the act. Only two changes have been made from existing legislation.

(1) In subsection (c), the authority of the Secretary is broadened to authorize him to make grants as well as to enter into contracts to "conduct research studies, investigations, demonstrations and evaluations" related to programs authorized by this act. In the new part, this authority is broadened to include making grants or contracts having to do with architectural, transportation, and other environmental and attitudinal barriers to the rehabilitation of handicapped individuals.

(2) Under subsection (e)(1), the Secretary is authorized to provide technical assistance in the area of architectural barriers as well as in other areas in which he already has specific authority.

SEC. 403. This section incorporates Section 8 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act having to do with increasing employment opportunities for the handicapped.

SEC. 404. National Information and Resource Center for the Handicapped.

This section is identical with S. 4202 which passed the Senate in 1970. It was generally referred to as the Dole bill. This bill has been reintroduced in 1971 as S. 41. It is included in this bill in order that it may be seen in connection with other responsibilities the Secretary has in administering rehabilitation legislation.

SEC. 405. Grants for Construction of Rehabilitation Facilities.

This section incorporates without important change section 12 of the present Vocational Rehabilitation Act having to do with rehabilitation facilities.

SEC. 406. Rehabilitation Facility Improvement.

This section includes the provisions of section 13 of the present Vocational Rehabilitation Act. There are no important changes.

SEC. 407. Special Projects.

This section includes the authority the Secretary currently has under section 4 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to pay the part of the cost of projects for demonstration, research, training, traineeships and projects for the establishment of special facilities and services which, in his judgment, hold promise of making a substantial contribution to the solution of rehabilitation problems common to all of the States. In this bill, we have taken the expansion grants authority from this section and included it in the title II program for initiation and expansion of rehabilitation services. This section also contains, somewhat broadened, the authority of the Secretary to undertake projects which experiment with new services or patterns of services, including new careers for handicapped individuals and new careers for other individuals who will serve handicapped people. The authority for undertaking new careers programs is currently found in section 4.

SEC. 408. National Center for Deaf-Blind Youth and Adults.

In section 408, we have language identical with that found in section 16 of the present Act.

SEC. 409. Comprehensive Rehabilitation Centers for Deaf Youths and Adults.

This is a new section. It authorizes the establishment by the Secretary of comprehensive rehabilitation centers for deaf youths and adults with particular emphasis upon the low (under) achieving deaf. It also permits research in the nature and prevention of problems of the low achieving deaf and the rehabilitation of these individuals, and the development of a program of public understanding of the problems of the low achieving deaf. The Secretary would have the authority to enter into an agreement with public or other nonprofit organizations to establish and operate such centers.

This bill is quite similar to H.R. 5610 introduced by Mr. Mills in the present session of Congress. The Mills bill would provide for the establishment of only one such center, while this legislation would authorize "centers". Otherwise, we think the objectives are very much the same.

SEC. 410. National Commission on Transportation and Housing for the Handicapped.

This section authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish a National Commission on Transportation and Housing for the Handicapped. The commission is to have not to exceed 15 members, with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Transportation, and the Secretary of the Treasury (or their designees) serving as ex-officio members.

The purpose of the commission shall be to consider how and to what extent transportation barriers impede the mobility of the handicapped; how travel expenses in connection with transportation to and from work for handicapped people can be met or subsidized when such individuals are unable to use mass transit systems or need special equipment in private transportation; what the housing needs of the handicapped people are and determine what is being done, especially by public and other nonprofit agencies and groups having interest in and the capacity to deal with the elimination of barriers from public transportation systems; how to prevent the incorporation of needless barriers in new or expanded transportation systems; how to make housing available and accessible to the handicapped and to meet sheltered housing needs; and prepare plans and proposals for further action as may be necessary along the lines indicated.

This commission is modeled to a considerable extent after the National Commission on Architectural Barriers, whose work made a tremendous impact in that field. The housing and transportation problems of handicapped people are acute and must be dealt with. The commission is given the usual authority to appoint advisory and technical experts and consultants.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

As indicated at the beginning of this document, this bill as written would replace the present Vocational Rehabilitation Act. Section 500 and section 501 are intended to bridge the gap between the old law and the new one.

THE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1971—WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW ABOUT IT

1. Question: Why is rehabilitation legislation being considered this year?

Answer: Appropriation authority for all titles of the present Vocational Rehabilitation Act expires June 30, 1972, and should be renewed this year. In addition, new legislation is needed to close existing gaps in services to handicapped people. The proposed legislation is designed to do both.

2. Question: What form does the legislation take?

Answer: The bill is written as a replacement for the present Vocational Rehabilitation Act. The provisions not being changed are in plain type. The new sections and changes in the old sections are in italics. It will be noted that there has been a rearrangement of sections. The bill as written would be the entire Vocational Rehabilitation Act as amended by the changes and additions being made in this legislation.

3. Question: What appropriations are being recommended for the basic state-federal vocational rehabilitation program?

Answer: For 1973, $800 million; for 1974, $950 million; for 1975, $1,200 million. The authorization in the present law for 1972 is $700 million. There will no longer be a separate section for "Innovation". There is no change in the allotment formula.

DEFINITIONS

4. Question: Have any changes been made in the definition of the handicapped individuals to be served by the state vocational rehabilitation agencies under this title?

Answer: Yes. The handicapped individual is defined to include an individual who is under a "behavioral disorder", a term already found in the regulations. This is to make clear the intent of Congress that state vocational rehabilitation agencies are to serve seriously maladjusted individuals who can profit from rehabilitation services but whose disabilities may not be readily identifiable by the usual medical or psychological examination. This will simplify the acceptance of public offenders, drop-outs from manpower programs and others, when these individuals are able to profit from rehabilitation services.

The bill also authorizes the Secretary of HEW to designate by regulations certain classes of handicapped individuals who are under a disability and have a substantial handicap to employment. In all cases, the determination as to whether the individual may reasonably be expected to benefit from vocational rehabilitation services will remain a professional decision to be made on the basis of an evaluation of rehabilitation potential.

5. Question: Is there any change in the definition of rehabilitation services that may be provided?

Answer: The only change is one that adds "follow along and other post employment services necessary" to the list of services, which is already comprehensive. This change will emphasize the fact that many seriously disabled individuals will require certain services long after they become remuneratively employed.

FUNDING

6. Question: Are there any changes in funding arrangements for the state-federal vocational rehabilitation program?

Answer: An important change is one that authorizes advanced funding applicable to all titles of the bill. Advanced funding will prevent a situation developing in which an appropriation has not been passed by Congress before the beginning of the fiscal year for which the appropriation is made. An appropriation for 2 years would be made once, after which appropriations would be made one year at a time.

7. Question: What about minimum allotments under the bill?

Answer: The language pertaining to minimum allotments is changed to provide a minimum allotment of $2 million per annum, an increase from $1 million per annum, or an amount indicated in the annual appropriation bill. This latter provision will make it unnecessary to get an amendment to the law in order to increase the minimum as the programs grow.

8. Question: Are any provisions made for joint funding of vocational rehabilitation and other programs with related goals?

Answer: Yes. State vocational rehabilitation agencies are authorized to enter into joint funding arrangements with other agencies to finance projects which will be administered by only one of the agencies involved. It will be possible to have a common federal share (average) for all funds involved in the joint effort, if this is requested. This provision should encourage cooperative efforts of social welfare, manpower, educational and rehabilitation agencies if legislation governing these other programs have similar provisions.

STATE AND LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

9. Question: Does the bill contain any changes in administrative arrangements?

Answer: There would be no changes at the federal level, the authority to administer the act remaining with the Secretary of HEW. At the state level, two changes are significant. The wording of present authority of the state agency to supervise the administration of vocational rehabilitation by a local unit of government is revised. The bill provides that vocational rehabilitation may be administered under the supervision of the state vocational rehabilitation agency by a "local service agency" which is defined as a unit of general local government (or combination of units) which has an agreement with the state vocational rehabilitation agency. It would be permissive for the local unit of government to utilize another public or voluntary agency in providing services, if such an arrangement is specified in the agreement between the state vocational rehabilitation agency and the local service agency. This provision will permit the state vocational rehabilitation agencies to cooperate with other agencies in local administration of their programs without mandating local administration.

In cases where the state agency does supervise administration of the program by a local service agency, there must be a broadly based local advisory committee, which will perform the functions usually provided by such an advisory committee and make reports to the state vocational rehabilitation agency on its findings.

10. Question: Are there other changes in administrative arrangements?

Answer: The state is authorized to submit a combined state plan which could include more than one title of the Rehabilitation Act of 1971 and the Developmental Disabilities Services and Construction Act. The reason for this permissive arrangement will be clearer as new programs are discussed.

The bill also updates the list of organizations with which the state vocational rehabilitation agency must have cooperative arrangements to include welfare and social service agencies, manpower agencies, and others.

INITIATION AND EXPANSION GRANTS

11. Question: What provisions does the bill have to encourage initiation and expansion of vocational rehabilitation services in the states?

Answer: One of the most important new provisions establishes a program of grants to the states to initiate or expand services. This section incorporates the expansion grant concept in Section 4(a)(2) of the present act and broadens it. Some of its features are as follows:

(a) The purpose of the section is to bring about a big expansion of services to certain classes of individuals who have unusual and difficult problems in connection with their rehabilitation and responsibility for whose training, education, and rehabilitation is shared by the state vocational rehabilitation agency with other agencies. Such classes include but are not limited to alcoholics, drug addicts, migratory farm workers, and public offenders. Rehabilitation has demonstrated competency to make an important contribution to the solution of problems of such handicapped individuals but has not had the resources to make a major impact. This legislation will make possible full cooperation of the rehabilitation agencies with correctional institutions, prevention and treatment programs for alcoholics and drug addicts and the various programs serving migratory farm workers. Properly funded, this section can result in a major breakthrough in the rehabilitation of many currently neglected handicapped individuals.

(b) Initiation and expansion programs will operate under a state plan. Grants may be made to state agencies or to other private nonprofit agencies. The federal government will pay 90% of the cost of projects developed under the proposal. Unused funds may be reallotted. Appropriation authorizations are $50 million for 1973; $60 million for 1974; $75 million for 1975.

(c) The duration of any one project is limited to three years. It is assumed that the financing of the project will be absorbed into the basic grant program at the end of that time, if it has been found to be successful.

VOCATIONAL EVALUATION AND WORK ADJUSTMENT

12. Question: Are there any changes proposed for Section 15 of the current Vocational Rehabilitation Act, Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Services?

Answer: As readers know, Section 15 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, passed in 1968, has not been funded. This section is retained in the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1971 with no important changes except one designed to mandate the funding of the program and another which permits Divisions for the Blind to participate in the program.

SERVICES FOR THE BLIND

13. Question: The bill contains a section called "Services for the Blind". What does this section propose?

Answer: Everyone knows that the rehabilitation of the blind is a difficult undertaking, especially the blind who have visual impairments compounded by age or cultural factors. The new section addresses itself to these special problems. Some significant features are as follows:

(a) The purpose of the section is to enable agencies for the blind to provide any service to a blind individual, not available from other sources, to enable him to attain maximum ability to be independent and self-supporting, including services not ordinarily considered vocational rehabilitation services. Of particular concern are older blind people who may need assistance in preparing for and securing part-time employment in workshops or elsewhere to supplement their retirement incomes, often inadequate to support them.

(b) Grants will be made to states on the basis of population and per capita income. Appropriation authority will be $15 million for 1973; $25 million for 1974; $40 million for 1975. Unused funds may be reallocated.

(c) The Secretary will be authorized to retain 10% of the appropriation for research, demonstration and training purposes.

(d) The program will be administered by the state agency administering vocational rehabilitation services for the blind or by this agency and other agencies as the state may determine. A non-duplicating service clause is included.

(e) The term "blind" or "visually handicapped" is defined as meaning a person who is blind or visually handicapped under the state law. Services are defined in the broadest possible way and include the authority to maintain a register of the blind.

THE DEAF

14. Question: The bill contains a section entitled "Services to the Deaf". What does this section propose?

Answer: The deaf and hearing impaired constitutes another group of handicapped individuals with unusually difficult problems, many of them related to the lack of communication skills. This section is designed to give authority and resources to state vocational rehabilitation agencies to deal comprehensively and competently with this group of handicapped people. As in the section on Services to the Blind, any service that makes a contribution to helping the individual achieve the ability to live independently and productively could be provided, including services that ordinarily would not be considered vocational rehabilitation services. Special emphasis will be put upon helping older people meet their needs, and in helping younger people with hearing loss maintain what hearing they have and improve their hearing by the use of mechanical and other means.

(a) As already indicated, services are defined in the most comprehensive way, concentrating on those services that contribute to the ability to communicate and including the authority to maintain a register of the deaf.

(b) Grants will be made to the states on the basis of population and per capita income. Authorizations are $15 million for 1973; $25 million for 1974; and $40 million for 1975. Unused funds may be reallotted.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to retain 10% of the appropriation for research, demonstration and training.

(d) The program will be administered by the state agency administering vocational rehabilitation or by that agency and other agencies having responsibility for services to the deaf in a state. A nonduplicating service clause is included.

SPECIAL FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITIES

15. Question: Why is a special part of the bill entitled "Special Federal Responsibilities"?

Answer: All of the special responsibilities of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare found in the current act, and some additional responsibilities, are brought together in this part of the bill. As related to the Secretary's general administrative responsibilities, the following items are important.

(a) The Secretary is authorized to conduct research, studies, investigations, demonstrations, and evaluation of programs under the present act. These existing provisions are included without major change, except that architectural, transportation, and other environmental and attitudinal barriers are included in the listing of problems appropriate for the Secretary to attack. The Secretary is also authorized to make grants as well as to enter into contracts to perform his functions.

(b) The authority of the Secretary to provide technical assistance and short term training and instruction in technical matters related to the provision of vocational rehabilitation services is retained with the added authority to make grants as well as to enter into contracts to perform these functions.

NATIONAL INFORMATION AND RESOURCE CENTER

16. Question: The bill contains a section entitled "National Information and Resource Center for the Handicapped". What is the purpose of this section?

Answer: This bill is almost identical with the bill introduced in the 91st Congress by Senator Robert Dole and passed by the Senate. Senator Dole's bill has been introduced in this session as S. 41. As the title of this section implies, its purpose is to concentrate in one place the collecting of data of all kinds relevant to problems and needs of handicapped people and to facilitate the dissemination of such information. The program is to be administered by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

REHABILITATION FACILITIES

17. Question: What provisions does the bill contain having to do with rehabilitation facilities?

Answer: The provisions in the present Vocational Rehabilitation Act defining and supporting rehabilitation facilities are incorporated in the bill without significant change. Also incorporated are the current rehabilitation facilities improvement grants provisions, including the training services program.

Appropriation authority for rehabilitation facilities (construction and rehabilitation facility improvement) is $20 million for 1973; $30 million for 1974; and $50 million for 1975. The National Policy and Performance Council is continued without change.

SPECIAL PROJECTS

18. Question: Are any important changes made in the special projects (research, demonstration and training) provisions of the current act?

Answer: The changes are minimal. The expansion grant provision, Subsection 4(a)(2), has been removed from this section placed in the initiation and expansion grant title. The new careers programs remain as an identifiable provision. There is no change in the method of making grants. Appropriation authority is proposed as follows: $75 million for 1973; $90 million for 1974; and $100 million for 1975.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR DEAF-BLIND YOUTH AND ADULTS

19. Question: Is any change being proposed in the section of the current act authorizing a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youth and Adults?

Answer: No changes are being recommended. This center is now under construction on Long Island Sound, with the Brooklyn Industrial Home for the Blind the contractor to develop this center. The center will be supported as a demonstration, research, training, and service center for the deaf-blind.

COMPREHENSIVE REHABILITATION CENTER FOR DEAF YOUTH AND ADULTS

20. Question: The bill has a section entitled "Comprehensive Rehabilitation Centers for Deaf Youth and Adults". What is the purpose of this section?

Answer: The federal government now supports a college for the deaf (Gallaudet) and a technical school for the deaf (Rochester). Many of the deaf are not able to profit from the educational opportunities provided in these institutions, and there are no institutions specifically charged with responsibility for assisting in the rehabilitation of the "low-achieving" deaf. Schools for the deaf make a contribution, but many of the low-achieving deaf do not graduate from these schools. General rehabilitation agencies, utilizing rehabilitation centers or other facilities, serve a considerable number of deaf people, but the low-achieving deaf, in the absence of facilities designed specifically for their use, present unusually difficult problems.

This section of the bill would provide federal support to establish and operate demonstration rehabilitation centers for the low-achieving deaf. It is assumed that they would be established on a regional or area basis and their findings made available to schools for the deaf and general rehabilitation facilities throughout the country, so these institutions can improve their services to the low-achieving deaf. The bill is similar to HR 5610 which has been introduced by Mr. Mills of Arkansas, the principal difference appearing to be that his bill would provide for the establishment of only one center, while this bill would make additional centers permissible.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING NEEDS

21. Question: Why do we need a National Commission on Transportation and Housing Needs of handicapped people?

Answer: Increasingly, it is being understood that environmental barriers prevent many handicapped individuals from achieving independence and self-support. A recent National Commission on Architectural Barriers made a great contribution to public awareness of architectural barriers which prevent people from living normal lives. The proposed commission would make a similar contribution in areas of public transportation and housing. It would also address itself to the financial problems of handicapped people going to and from work, who cannot use public transportation. Operating under the Secretary of HEW, the commission will involve many other agencies of the federal government, including the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Transportation, both of which have resources to make a valuable contribution to the solution of these problems.

EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID ACT

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge the prompt consideration and passage of the Emergency School Aid Act. It has been more than a year since this important measure was transmitted to the 91st Congress by the President and more than 6 months since the House passed a version of the bill, only to see it die in the Senate.

The Emergency School Aid Act would provide $1.5 billion in much-needed support for schools across the Nation which are reducing or eliminating racial isolation. We have entered a new phase of the school desegregation effort. On April 20 the U.S. Supreme Court, in Swann against Charlotte-Mecklenburg, ruled that school districts which were previously segregated by law must use every practical means at their disposal to accomplish desegregation at the earliest possible date. One significant effect of this decision is that school districts, facing increased expenditures from tightly restricted budgets, are requesting assistance from the Federal Government.

In addition to those school districts required by law to desegregate, there are many more who are seeking to eliminate racial isolation where it has not been determined to be contrary to the law. Among these districts are the Nation's large urban school systems, many of which face serious financial crises if additional support is not forthcoming.

Many of our school districts are facing the threat of curtailment of services and the loss of valuable faculty at the time when the Nation is calling upon them to make good on the promise of equality of educational opportunity. If we are to seriously expect performance from the schools in this important area, then we must be willing to authorize the funds necessary to meet some of the additional costs which result.

The policy of our Nation is clear on the subject of equal access to public educational institutions. The President has shown his commitment to this goal by proposing the Emergency School Aid Act. I urge the House to act on it at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point this morning's timely editorial from the Washington Post:

MORE ON AN AGING EMERGENCY

It was March of 1970 when Mr. Nixon first proposed a two-year, $1.5 billion program of federal assistance to desegregating schools. A couple of months later the President sent his actual legislation to the Hill. It passed the House in the hectic last days of the session and died in the Senate. Then the Senate, this spring, revived and improved the measure, which it passed by an unequivocal vote of seventy-four to eight. Now it is the House—more precisely, Chairman Roman Pucinski's Subcommittee on Education—that is holding up the works by failing to act.

A great deal has happened recently that makes it more urgent than ever that this legislation, in some form, be enacted and put into effect. First, there was the Supreme Court's April decision in the case of *Swann versus the Charlotte-Mecklenburg* (N.C.)

Board of Education. In that and a number of related cases simultaneously decided, the court unanimously upheld the authority of federal courts to impose far reaching school desegregation plans on districts found guilty of deliberate, officially-inspired segregation in the past. These were the so-called "busing" decisions. Second, there has been, since *Swann*, evidence of an unexpected resolve on the part of the Nixon administration to put its weight behind the high court's ruling: in Austin, Texas and Nashville, Tennessee it has come forward with desegregation plans that go well beyond the minimum requirements of a narrow reading of the court in *Swann*. Austin and Nashville both would be obliged under these schemes to engage in extensive busing. So, it must be supposed, would other big city school systems that are likely to be affected by the Swann decision and the administration's revised approach.

That is where the legislation currently stalled in the House comes in. At a time when numerous recalcitrant school systems are finally getting the message and getting around to acting on it, that is to say, laying plans for large scale desegregation, the incentive funds provided in this measure would be of enormous benefit to them. Such funds could and would be used for everything from studies of curriculum changes to teacher training courses and the outright purchase of buses—Austin, it is estimated, might have to acquire over one hundred more buses to put its proposed desegregation plan into effect. In the wake of Senate passage of the bill in April, it was hoped that speedy House action would make it possible to start dispensing money in time to give these districts some idea of what help was coming and some solid guidance in their plans. Now it seems doubtful that funds will be available even by the time schools reopen in the early fall.

Apparently the delay in the House subcommittee proceeds from the view of Chairman Pucinski and others that the revised Senate bill is inferior to the measure they reported last winter and that it paves the way for some sort of massive and undesirable rearrangement of school systems in the North, or at least some massive and undesirable pressure on such systems to integrate totally. There is doubt in many quarters that this reading of the Senate bill is an accurate one. But even if it is, there is nothing that says Mr. Pucinski and his colleagues must report out a bill identical to that which passed the Senate. Why shouldn't they report out the measure they see fit and take their chances on the floor and/or in conference? The point is that *some legislation*, subject to the usual pull and haul of the conference process, should be reported and acted on in the House while it is still timely. This opportunity has been too long in coming to be squandered now.

WHIPPING BOYS

(Mr. RANDALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have just received the contents of the commencement address of Governor Warren E. Hearnes recently delivered at the commencement exercises of Central Missouri State College located in Warrensburg, Mo., which is within the congressional district it has been our honor and privilege to represent for many years.

After reading the contents of those remarks I concluded that the Governor of my State had selected a theme which he treated with originality and which he applied to contemporary significance.

In his address, Governor Hearnes, challenged the graduates to confront the major issues of today not only with the passion of rightful idealism but also with the cool application of reason. He most appropriately calls a mal-assigned target a whipping boy and proceeds to cite contemporary examples which show far too many persons would prefer to use a whipping boy rather than apply logic in order to reach the true cause of a problem.

Warren E. Hearnes has served ably as Governor of Missouri. He has both legislative and executive experience that spans a period of 25 years. His remarks were worth hearing and it is my opinion that they are worth sharing with my colleagues. It is a distinct pleasure to be able to read into the RECORD at this time the remarks of Governor Hearnes:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY
GOV. WARREN E. HEARNES

In ancient times there was a school of thought among royalty that a young prince either could not be officially recognized as having done wrong, or at least that he was set apart from and above the standards of discipline applied to other people his age.

Accordingly, it became the practice for a young prince or nobleman to be educated with a companion. Whenever the prince misbehaved, the companion received the punishment. And in that kind of relationship, the companion was known as a "whipping boy".

The custom of using whipping boys supposedly was erased long ago, but I contend that the basic principle is alive and well and being employed in America today. In truth, there has been a transformation over the years and today we must look at social issues rather than royalty in order to find traces of the whipping boy syndrome.

As it is practiced now, society at large focuses its attention on selected targets connected with major social issues. The result is that we pay too little attention to underlying problems which must be resolved.

At this time of commencement, when you begin your lives apart from the college campus, it is imperative that you have a clear vision of some of the whipping boys which exist in modern America. It is imperative for the reason that you can come to grips with public attitudes about controversial issues only if you understand those attitudes.

There is an example which is highly appropriate in light of the fact that tonight's occasion inaugurates the Harry S. Truman Lecture Series on this campus. In 1949, President Truman proposed a national health insurance plan for the United States. He was standing firm in his conviction that the full range of medical facilities in our Nation should be available to all citizens.

The attention of the country became focused on the spectre of socialized medicine and his proposal was defeated. National Health insurance seemed to be in conflict with our cherished belief in an independent medical profession. We must recognize, however, that the intervening twenty-two years have not brought the development of a health care delivery system reaching all the people. We also must recognize, by examining the issue rather than the whipping boy, that it is indeed possible to have health insurance for everyone without having socialized medicine.

That fact is now recognized by a Republican President and the leaders of a Democratic Congress, and with proposals coming from both major political parties it is just a matter of time until some form of agreement is reached.

In this instance, people of differering political and philosophical beliefs are setting aside the ogre of a particular whipping boy in order to concentrate on rational discussion about a serious problem. By avoiding the emotionally charged companion target and focusing instead on the basic issue, men of good will are finding that there is common ground for a solution. I believe this example should serve as an object lesson for each of us.

Sometimes we lash out at selected targets because we accept widespread public impressions as being factual when they are not. For instance, frequent references to segregated schools in the South have caused many people to feel that they have no segregation problems in their own backyards. We have, as a society, used the South during the past several years as our whipping boy for racial problems.

Since my personal observations disagreed with that North-South theory, I went to the trouble just a few months ago of comparing enrollment figures for the public schools of St. Louis City with those of Jackson, Mississippi. The results were even more unusual than I had expected.

Of the 172 public schools in St. Louis City, seven were composed 100 percent of white students and 76 schools were 100 percent non-white. In other words, nearly half the schools in St. Louis were completely segregated. In Jackson, Mississippi, however, there were no all-white schools and only one that was 100 percent non-white. There was just one fully segregated school out of 55 in the city.

Another way to measure a school system is to look at the number of schools where there is a considerable degree of racial balance—where the majority race in a particular school is from 50 percent to 70 percent of the total student population. Both cities had the same number of schools in that category, but in St. Louis it was 22 schools out of a total of 172 and in Jackson it was 22 of 55.

I did not have those statistics compiled in order to praise one school system or criticize another, but to prove a point to my own satisfaction—the point being that there are matters of serious concern which go untended because our attention is diverted toward the wrong targets.

If we allow ourselves to become the victims of that process, our behavior is not much superior to the angry charging of a red cape in a bullfight. For this, truly, is the essence of the problem. A society of rational human beings strikes out blindly at major issues because someone waves a red flag in front of us. It might be an appeal to emotions of discrimination, prejudice or rigid political philosophy, with the result that we react from a foundation of anger rather than reason.

You should know, because you have been on the receiving end. Public support for higher education is not quite as strong now as it was just a few years ago, and not because education has become less important but because the public is reacting to the small groups of lawbreakers on college campuses.

You also have felt the brunt of public opposition to a reduced voting age, and it arises not from any carefully considered view that you as an individual lack the intelligence or maturity to cast a vote. You and I know the real reason. The opposition is largely a reaction to reports of campus riots, disruptive protest movements and the illegal use of drugs. All college students are suf-

fering under the brand of guilt of association.

College students are not the only ones whose legitimate needs have been sidetracked by incidents which arouse public anger. I spoke a few moments ago of racial balance in public schools, a topic which has fanned so much emotion that it detracts from the primary goal of operating good school systems.

American society has adopted a goal of integration, where each person can be judged by his own actions and not the color of his skin. From that simple precept, however, partisans on both sides have frequently moved toward hardened and unrealistic positions. Some people seem to feel that busing students from one school to another would miraculously solve all our problems, while others feel that busing should never be employed under any circumstances.

For a long period, the United States Supreme Court has functioned as the whipping boy for that particular issue. It was pretty easy for everyone to criticize the court and not bother to take a very close look at the practical facts of life.

It therefore must have come as a surprise to the critics when the Supreme Court, now composed of a new mix of both conservatives and liberals, recently issued a unanimous verdict concerning the busing of students to achieve racial balance. The point which intrigued me, however, was the net effect of that decision and also the theory which was clearly outlined in the opinion.

The Court stated that the practice of busing for racial balance is neither inherently good nor inherently evil. It approved busing for that purpose in a specific case where buses had been used to perpetuate segregation, and where an integrated system would not result in longer bus rides for small children. The decision stressed that each local school situation has its own complexities and no blanket policy could reasonably be applied.

In other words, the Court merely got back to our original position as a society; back to the position that the government should act to strike down legal segregation but that the issue of discrimination is a human problem not subject to simplistic solutions through government.

I cannot help but think that our national preoccupation with criticizing the Supreme Court has caused us to lose valuable time in curbing discrimination. After years of emotionalism, we have come full circle to the position that government can be used to stop illegal actions but that brotherhood is our own responsibility.

All this talk of whipping boys and false targets has been for the purpose of leading up to one basic thought. I want to place in your minds tonight the question of whether you are really as different from older generations as you like to think.

Will you leave the academic life and yet retain the willingness to make decisions using reason rather than emotion? Will you carefully consider the constant flow of emotionally charged public issues such as racism, poverty and war, reacting according to proven facts—or will you begin to mouth preconceived notions and start to lash out at the whipping boys which obscure the real issues?

You enter adult society now as educated young men and women, undoubtedly with the hope that you can somehow help to make this world a better place in which to live. And I say to you that you will fail unless you manage to keep your emotions under control and rely instead upon the discipline of an educated mind.

Forget the old adage of fighting fire with fire, because the last thing we need in America today is an increase in the amount of anger, tension and frustration. You do have an obligation to use your education as a force for improvement, but that does not mean you should engage in a shouting contest. Your responsibility is to bring a calm and rational perspective into the arena of major social issues.

Take that one issue of a reduced voting age as an example. If you buy the argument that all 18 year olds are immature radicals who cannot be trusted with the vote, you are wrong. If you engage in a bitter debate with those who advance that line of reasoning, you are wrong. And if you contend that all 18 year olds are brilliant and mature decision makers, you are wrong. Given the present set of social conditions in the United States, you as young college graduates simply cannot afford to fall into the trap of irrational behavior.

If there is one need which stands out above all others in our country at this time, it is the need for reason and common sense in dealing with social issues. This nation now suffers from the intensity of heat which generates very little light. From all sides we are bombarded with emotional accusations about Vietnam, poverty, prejudice and pollution.

The greatest service which your generation can provide is to curb the use of blind emotionalism in shaping public policy. You can help us get back to the path where people of good will and divergent viewpoints can work together, thoroughly examining their problems in a common search for effective solutions.

Your generation will, indeed, build a better world if the divisiveness in our country can be healed. You will inherit a sick society if it cannot. For that reason I hope there is a generation gap, one which will enable you to turn away from "whipping boy" patterns and come to grips with the real needs of this nation.

BOTH A MORAL AND LEGAL OBLIGATION

(Mr. RANDALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, on May 20, 1971, the House considered the conference report on H.R. 8190, the second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971. On that day there was a rollcall vote on the item of $155,800,000 for necessary expenses to terminate the civil supersonic aircraft program and for refunds of amounts contributed by our airlines toward research and development of the SST.

On rollcall No. 105, when the yeas and nays were ordered, I voted "No" because the $155 million item contained $58.5 million without any previous authorization bill as a refund to our airlines who had made their respective contributions. It is my understanding 11 different airlines had made deposits which should certainly be refunded.

Now, after the passage of 3 weeks I believe it is time to look back and carefully consider what happened as a result of rollcall No. 105 on which 117 answered "yea" and 157 answered "nay" and accordingly the item of $155,800,000 was not agreed to.

As I understand the facts, the figure of $155 million contained $85 million of termination costs to be divided between Boeing and General Electric. It is my further understanding that it contained an item of $12 million for administrative costs to the Government to close out this program. There are subcontractors all over the country who have had a part in the program in the various stages of development. All their work will have to be inventoried. The exact amount they are entitled to will have to be carefully assessed. This will entail substantial costs to the Defense Contract Audit Agency. Thus, when $12 million administrative cost is added to the $85 million to Boeing and General Electric the total becomes $97,300,000.

The record of the House on May 20 will show that after the House defeated the motion to concur with the Senate, on the $155 million, the House thereafter promptly agreed to the $97,300,000. It is my purpose at this time, from the vantage point of 3 weeks later, to consider the merits of refunding the $58 million due our airlines which was denied to them on May 20. By a simple arithmetical computation one can see that if the House defeated an appropriation of $155 million but later approved $97 million supplemental appropriation, it was the $58 million due the airlines which was eliminated by the yea-and-nay vote in the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I followed the debate of May 20 very carefully. I know that the original House bill for the second supplemental which was sent over to the Senate contained only the $85 million in termination costs without any provision for administrative costs of the Government audit agencies and without any refund to the airlines. The Senate added $12 million administrative costs and $58.5 million refund for our airlines. It was that action by the Senate that caused the issue to be joined and left the two Houses in disagreement.

Well, clearly, $12 million is a lot of money for accounting and bookkeeping. But if there is to be a seasonably good job done it may take all of that because there are not only primary contractors, but also many subcontractors scattered all over the country. Part of this money is needed for the purpose of negotiation. There are many factors when a contract is terminated. Certainly alleged costs cannot be negotiated unless the funds are available to carry out the negotiations.

The debate on the floor on May 20 was conducted on a high level. It was most interesting. The question was raised whether to reimburse the airlines, by refunding their deposits in an appropriations bill. A point of order was suggested because there had been no previous authorization bill. That seemed to me to be a valid contention. Then, also the argument was raised as to whether or not these claims should be previously adjudicated in a court of claims. These were undoubtedly some of the reasons which caused the House to omit the $58.5 million for the airlines when the supplemental bill was first sent over to the Senate.

In my judgment, these refunds should be considered separately, rather than intermingled with payment termination costs to General Electric and Boeing. That is why on rollcall No. 105 I voted "no." Let me hasten to add, there is no doubt that all of our airlines can make

a perfect case for a refund first, because they were induced to make the contribution and second, because they had actually entered into a contract which the Government, by its cancellation of the SST, caused the breach. It is quite probable that the payment of interest may be justified to our airlines. I say this because in my opinion, there is not only a moral obligation to refund these amounts contributed by airlines, but there is also a legal obligation.

Certainly the second supplemental appropriation bill was not the only remedy available to the airlines. Their contributions could be construed to be a downpayment on aircraft they intended to purchase. It was made in good faith. Their money is still on deposit. We, the Congress, voted to terminate the SST. The airlines are entitled to their refunds. The only question was whether the Congress should hurriedly decide the amount that is due the airlines based upon some kind of an estimate at the end of a long legislative day, on May 20 or whether the claim should have been more carefully heard and considered by our Appropriations Committee and with an accurate showing of the amounts advanced by each airline.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to represent a district which serves as the bedroom for many thousands of airline employees who work for Trans World Airlines in the Kansas City area. TWA is my hometown airline. I know that they, in good faith, put up $11,500,000. The Secretary of Transportation should be required to reimburse TWA for this amount invested in good faith. There are other airlines equally entitled to reimbursement.

Some airlines that are not our flag carriers have invested small amounts. All of them are entitled to the return of their money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the reason that I have taken the time today to reconsider our action of Thursday, May 20, 3 weeks ago, is to review the circumstances surrounding these contributions and to provide background information pertaining to these deposits by our U.S. airlines.

First, it should be recalled President Johnson established an Advisory Committee to consider the pros and cons of the U.S. Government participation in the development of one or more prototype aircraft. That Committee recommended to the President that he seek appropriations to construct two prototype aircraft. The same Advisory Committee also urged that airlines be required to participate as a condition precedent to additional Federal financing.

It should be recalled that Alan S. Boyd, now president of the Illinois Central Railroad, was then Secretary of Transportation back in 1967 when the airlines were called in to discuss deposits of substantial amounts toward the development of the prototype aircraft. The record will show that the representatives of approximately 16 U.S. airlines were called together in the city of Washington on February 6, 1967. The meeting was held to outline the reasons why they provide at least $1 million as a deposit for each aircraft on which an airline held a delivery position.

I am reliably advised by information received from some of those who were present that the atmosphere of that meeting was that the Government planned to go forward with the SST if the airlines made their deposits. That was the tone of the meeting. It was made clear that the deposits would be at the risk of the airlines but would be forfeited only in the event Boeing could not succeed in building a plane that would be economically viable and capable of safe operation at design speed.

The Secretary of Transportation who in February of 1967 was Alan S. Boyd, in a recent letter to a Member of the other body, reported that the tone of the meeting certainly carried the assumption by all concerned that the only risk connected with the deposits was in connection with failure that might be related to the aircraft itself. In that meeting there was no discussion and no assumption that there would be a sacrifice of the deposits due to a failure of continuing Federal participation. That kind of sacrifice was never contemplated in 1967. It was not considered or agreed to then. It is therefore impossible now to at this late date, read into that understanding of 1967 any new condition of forfeiture not contained or considered at the meeting over 4 years ago.

Of course, none of us who are Members of Congress were present at that February meeting in 1967, but I have been told by reliable persons who were present that there was considerable urging by Mr. Boyd who was Secretary of Transportation at that time for our U.S. carriers to make a prompt deposit. I am not saying the administration of that day resorted to its quite common arm-twisting practices, but I do know that it was made very plain to our carriers that they had to make a deposit of a substantial amount for each aircraft on which each airline expected to reserve a delivery position. That figure was finally set at $1 million per aircraft.

Well, the foregoing provides some measure of background information pertaining to the history of the deposits by our U.S. airlines to further the development program of the SST aircraft. If it is decided that there should first be an authorization bill prior to a separate appropriations bill, then well and good. If it is believed there should be a detailed audit of the claims of each airline based upon return of the principal deposit with accrued interest, then there should be no objection by any interested party. Whatever course is considered to be the most appropriate one, certainly the procedure which is the most expeditious should be followed.

The economic health of some of our airlines is not as robust as it was in former years. Morally and legally they are entitled to a refund of their deposits. It is the clear obligation of the Congress, now that the issues have been clearly outlined and all background information has been provided, to proceed expeditiously.

WERE EAGLES POISONED DELIBERATELY?

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, in preparing for a program on the bald eagle next Monday evening, I recently visited the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, which is located in Maryland near Fort Meade, and watched the autopsy of one of the 22 eagles tragically poisoned in Jackson Canyon, in Wyoming.

Some of these eagles were golden eagles and some were bald eagles, the latter being a major symbol of our Nation.

The Patuxent Wildlife Research Center found that thallium sulfate was the cause of the deaths. There have been reports stemming from Senate hearings that the circumstances of the deaths indicate that ranchers put the thallium in bait for coyotes, which prey on sheep.

But from the conversations members of my staff and I have had with persons familiar with this poisoning, the evidence appears to be strong the poisoning of the eagles was deliberate.

We were told:

First. That the canyon is not a very suitable grazing area for sheep and that the poisoned meat did not appear to be laid out on the likely routes a coyote might take to reach sheep.

Second. That, instead, the poison was placed along the canyon in such a way that eagles might be attracted to it.

Third. That it was placed at a time when bald eagles were nesting in the area and during the briefer period when golden eagles were migrating through.

And fourth. That the myth persists in some parts of the West that the golden eagle, whose speedy flight might take it from the canyon to ranching areas, kills useful animals.

There are other aspects to this case.

There are Federal penalties for deliberately killing an eagle—but this deliberateness is hard to prove, even perhaps in a case such as this.

Also, the canyon is not Federal property, but even if it had been, there appears to be no strong Federal law barring the setting out of poisons on federally owned lands.

This appears to be a shocking gap in the law.

Another aspect of this case is thallium itself. It is a poison which kills slowly and horribly. Small amounts can be absorbed through the skin. Even if this is not fatal, chronic health problems may result.

Thallium's use has declined greatly, but seven manufacturers still have Federal licenses to transport it across State lines. Considering the horrors of this poison and its deadly and chronic effects, serious consideration should be given to legislation banning the manufacture of this poison.

The Interior Department told a Senate hearing that it has asked the Environmental Protection Agency to bar the interstate transport of this poison for purposes of animal control, but this may not be sufficient. Apparently, the poison used in Wyoming was labeled for use in manufacturing.

Perhaps very soon there may be an arrest in Wyoming in this case. Wyoming law forbids the use of poison in meat for the killing of other animals. I am spon-

soring a program on the bald eagle at 8 p.m. in the caucus room of the Cannon Building—and I am hopeful that an arrest may be made by then.

But that should not be allowed to be the end of this case—or of our search for ways to protect the eagle and other wildlife.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF GAO

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago this week the Congress enacted the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921. The act established the General Accounting Office and created the position of Comptroller General of the United States to head that Office.

History, in my opinion, has demonstrated the wisdom and foresight of that action. With "tax, tax, tax and spend, spend, spend" seemingly having become the accepted way of life, I think it singularly appropriate that the House take this occasion to pay tribute to this agency and its head that are dedicated to "telling it as it is" regarding Federal expenditures.

The General Accounting Office was created as an independent, reliable, nonpolitical agency through which the Congress could exercise its constitutional control over revenues and expenditures. In its early days and, to a degree, up to World War II, Federal programs and appropriations to carry them out generally were on an annual basis except for large construction. During that period the Office gained respect for its independence and integrity in the audit of transactions and rendition of legal rulings.

The need for change in the General Accounting Office's methods of discharging its responsibilities, beginning to become apparent in the waning depression years, became urgent during World War II. It became necessary to increase the staff to 15,000 people to deal with the tremendous burden of wartime transactions. As the pace and scope of Federal Government activities have accelerated during the quarter century since then, the General Accounting Office has had to meet the increasing demands on it by corresponding expansion and changes.

The requisite changes have included the imposition by statute of several additional key responsibilities. The most recent of these was the provision, in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, for General Accounting Office assistance to the Congress in the development of information systems and by performing specialized analytical services. In the main, however, the changes have been accomplished by the General Accounting Office upgrading and broadening the range and capabilities of its staff and by the introduction of more professional and sophisticated techniques. Over 60 percent of the General Accounting Office staff are full professionals. The quality and extent of services to the Congress have been improved although the number of personnel has dropped to about 5,000 from the wartime peak.

We now are spending about $102 billion a year on meeting human needs and improving our environment. We have programs intended to provide income security and to correct or alleviate agricultural, educational, housing, health, nutrition, and other social and economic problems and conditions. The price will go up to about $110 billion next year. In each of these areas numerous broad gage programs are under way or proposed. Most of them involve a variety of methods and approaches. The points of attack on known or speculative problems and conditions have multiplied by almost geometrical progression.

Many of the real problems are multiple faceted. Many of the programs and points of attack overlap and, in some cases, are at variance with or counterproductive to other programs and proposed cures. The whole structure shows signs of becoming so unwieldy as to inhibit solution of the urgent problems involved. Strong, prompt action to correct this tendency seems indicated lest it collapse of its own weight. Also, the point of diminishing return may be near in these efforts as well as in their size and cost to the Federal Government. This is the environment in which the Comptroller General and the General Accounting Office now operate in their efforts to strain mismanagement and financial extravagance from this tide.

The Comptroller General and the General Accounting Office serve the Congress by searching continually for means of achieving greater effectiveness in the execution of authorized programs and increased economy and efficiency in the management of program execution.

The General Accounting Office audits and reviews the manner in which Federal programs are carried out and provides direct assistance to the Congress in a number of ways. It prescribes principles and standards for accounting in Federal agencies and settles claims by and against the United States. The Comptroller General gives legal advice to the Congress, its committees and members. He also renders legal opinions to heads of departments and agencies and other officials that are binding on them with respect to the legality of expenditures.

The General Accounting Office's basic audit and review work, except for that performed under the Government Corporation Control Act, is, with few exceptions, directed primarily toward ascertaining first, how effectively programs are accomplishing the objectives contemplated by the authorizing laws, and second, how economically and efficiently they have been managed relative to those accomplishments.

The concept of this approach is simple; its application is tremendously complex and difficult. Consider, for example, how to evaluate a single ecological program such as alleviation of pollution in inland waterways. Or one of the inner-city type such as housing or education. In the defense area, think of a major weapon system research and development, procurement, production, deployment, and maintenance. What were the bases on which management decisions were made between alternative courses of action at each successive stage? How valid were they? How well and economically were those decisions executed? With what results? Could the job have been done better and for less cost on the basis of information available at the time action decisions were made?

Identification and evaluation of all of these problems and many more must be planned for in advance and accomplished by seeking out and appraising all pertinent factual information. Trails often are obscure and situations confused or obfuscated. Second-guessing or inconclusive observations will not do. The General Accounting Office must dig up and, in effect, recreate the environment in which decisions were made and actions taken in order to be able to judge those decisions and actions. Use of sophisticated and esoteric decisionmaking techniques often is required in order to evaluate decisions made and actions taken on the basis of such techniques or in situations susceptible of their application. The General Accounting Office does these things as a matter of course under its general statutory responsibilities.

Over and above its regular audit and review work, the General Accounting Office provides invaluable direct assistance to the Congress. About one-fifth of its 2,900-member professional staff is engaged each year in providing such assistance. Some are assigned to congressional committees to augment committee staffs. Special reviews, investigations or surveys are made at the specific request of congressional committees or Members; the Comptroller General or his representatives are called upon frequently to testify before committees.

In addition, the General Accounting Office furnishes reports on several hundred legislative bills during each session of the Congress at the request of various committees. It also analyzes all bills introduced in the Congress as to whether information developed in the course of the General Accounting Office's accounting, auditing, investigative or legal work may be useful to committees in their consideration of the bills. If so, General Accounting Office provides such information.

As the General Accounting Office moves into its second half century I am honored to express to the present Comptroller General and his staff my grateful appreciation and, I believe, that of the entire House, for their continuing dedicated service to the Congress and the Nation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. VEYSEY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), from June 10, 1971, through June 19, 1971, on account of official business.

Mr. PEYSER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for June 14 and 15, on account of official business.

Mr. PELLY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for June 14 through 18, on account of congressional business in district.

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHMITZ) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PRICE of Texas, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. FINDLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKUBITZ, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Tennessee) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FLOOD, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSENTHAL, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RARICK, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. PODELL, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. ASPIN, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ASPINALL, and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHMITZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. PRICE of Texas.

Mr. FISH in two instances.

Mr. MARTIN in three instances.

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. BOB WILSON in three instances.

Mr. SCHMITZ in two instances.

Mr. FINDLEY in two instances.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. SCHWENGEL in five instances.

Mr. ERLENBORN.

Mr. LLOYD.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

Mr. MCCOLLISTER in three instances.

Mr. WARE.

Mr. GOLDWATER in two instances.

Mrs. REID of Illinois.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. REID of New York in two instances.

Mr. ROUSSELOT.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Tennessee) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHEUER in five instances.

Mrs. ABZUG.

Mr. ECKHARDT in three instances.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama in two instances.

Mr. MOORHEAD.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. DINGELL in three instances.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. BEVILL.

Mr. PICKLE in five instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Mr. HUNGATE in two instances.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mr. MAHON.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas in two instances.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

Mr. WALDIE in five instances.

Mr. HAWKINS in two instances.

Mrs. SULLIVAN in three instances.

Mr. BARRETT.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in three instances.

Mr. MEEDS.

Mr. DOWNING in two instances.

Mr. MANN.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia in three instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 101. An act to provide for the disposition of a portion of the funds to pay a judgment in favor of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of Indians of Fort Hall, Idaho; the Shoshone Tribe of Indians of the Wind River Reservation, Wyoming; the Bannock Tribe and the Shoshone Nation or Tribe of Indians in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 326–D, 326–E, 326–F, 326–G, 326–H, 366, and 367, consolidated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1462. An act to provide for the distribution of the Sisseton and Wahpeton Tribes of Sioux Indians of their portion of the funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Mississippi Sioux Indians in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 142 and 353, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1444. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Snohomish Tribe in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 125, the Upper Skagit Tribe in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 92, and the Snoqualmie and Skykomish Tribes in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 93, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 4353. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma and of Kansas and Nebraska in Indian Claims Commission dockets No. 79–A, 153, 158, 209, and 231, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 557. An act to amend the Wagner-O'Day Act to extend its provisions relating to Government procurement of commodities produced by the blind to commodities produced by other severely handicapped individuals, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 14, 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:

821. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the request for appropriations transmitted in the budget for fiscal year 1972 for Peace Corps activities of the Action agency (H. Doc. No. 92–122); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

822. A letter from the adjutant general, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the 72d National Encampment, United Spanish War Veterans, September 6–10, 1970, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 92–123); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

823. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report of Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for the period July 1970-February 1971, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

824. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a District of Columbia Development Bank to mobilize the capital and the expertise of the private community to provide for an organized approach to the problems of economic development in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

825. A letter from the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide compensation for disability or death resulting from injury to employees in certain employments in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

826. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on the Social Security Administration's activities and experience in the implementation of the black lung benefits program, pursuant to section 426(b) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 (30 U.S.C. 936(b)); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

827. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on foreign credits by the U.S. Government as of June 30, 1970, pursuant to section 634(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

828. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a report on food production and population growth in less developed countries, pursuant to title XI of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

829. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to declare that certain public lands are held in trust by the United States for the Summit Lake Paiute Tribe.

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

830. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to declare that certain federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

831. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report of the final determination of the Commission in docket No. 271, *The Cherokee Nation, Plaintiff,* v. *The United States of America, Defendant,* pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

832. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report of the final determination of the Commission in docket No. 336, *The Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma and the Absentee Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma, et al., Plaintiffs,* v. *The United States of America, Defendant,* pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

833. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a report on the racial and ethnic impact of the program of homeownership for lower income families operated under title I of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, commonly known as section 235, pursuant to Public Law 85–315; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

834. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit immediate retirement of certain Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

835. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on problems and suggestions for improvements in determining Army major equipment needs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

836. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on potential savings by replacing Government-owned sedans each year by the General Services Administration; 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. BURTON of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8787. A bill to provide that the unincorporated territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands shall each be represented in Congress by a Delegate to the House of Representatives; (Rept. No. 92–270). 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. ARCHER:

H.R. 9036. A bill to provide a Federal income tax deduction for expenditures for purchase and installation of air pollution control devices on used vehicles and to provide for certification of such devices by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 9037. A bill relating to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the environmental impact of the proposed trans-Alaska oil pipeline; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 9038. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to achieve certain reforms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 9039. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services Administration to contract for the construction of certain parking facilities on federally owned property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CONABLE (for himself and Mr. CAREY of New York):

H.R. 9040. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from the Federal estate tax for certain debt obligations of domestic corporations in cases where the interest on such obligations would be treated as income from foreign sources for purpose of the interest equalization tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.R. 9041. A bill to protect ocean mammals from being pursued, harassed, or killed; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 9042. A bill to provide a penalty for the theft of certain explosives, to provide increased penalties for certain crimes relating to explosives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9043. A bill to strengthen the penalty provisions of the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON (for himself, Mr. GRAY, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 9044. A bill to amend the act of December 22, 1944, relating to the sale of electric power from reservoir projects under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HENDERSON (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. HAGAN, Mr. HALEY, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mr. HATHAWAY):

H.R. 9045. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, to increase the Federal contribution to 90 percent of the cost of shore restoration and protection projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HENDERSON (for himself, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LENNON, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SIKES, Mr. STEELE, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 9046. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, to increase the Federal contribution to 90 percent of the cost of shore restoration and protection projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9047. A bill making appropriations to carry out the lead-based-paint-poisoning prevention program for the fiscal years of 1971 and 1972; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 9048. A bill requesting the President and the Secretary of State to urge the Government of the U.S.S.R. to release Ruth Aleksandrovich, a Soviet Jew, and other similarly situated persons, from imprisonment reportedly resulting from their desire to emigrate from the U.S.S.R. to Israel, and to urge the Government of the U.S.S.R. to allow all persons desiring to leave that country to do so; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, and Mr. PRICE of Illinois):

H.R. 9049. A bill to establish a transportation trust fund, to encourage urban mass transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. MIKVA, and Mr. BIAGGI):

H.R. 9050. A bill to establish a transportation trust fund, to encourage urban mass transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H.R. 9051. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to strengthen and reform certain provisions thereof; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 9052. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain agricultural aircraft from the aircraft use tax, to provide for the refund of the gasoline tax to the agricultural aircraft operator with the consent of the farmer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKAY (for himself and Mr. LLOYD):

H.R. 9053. A bill to establish the Arches National Park and the Capitol Reef National Park, to revise the boundaries of the Canyonlands National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas:

H.R. 9054. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to permit military service performed by an individual after 1956 to be credited under the civil service retirement program, even though such individual is eligible for social security benefits, if such individual has elected to have such service excluded in the computation of such benefits; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 9055. A bill to regulate interstate commerce by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the inspection of facilities used in the harvesting and processing of fish and fishery products for commercial purposes, for the inspection of fish and fishery products, and for cooperation with the States in the regulation of intrastate commerce with respect to State Fish inspection programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 9056. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by adding a new section to prohibit sales below cost for the purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competitor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN (for himself, Mrs. REID of Illinois, and Mr. DENT):

H.R. 9057. A bill to establish drug abuse control organizations in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DENT, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FRASER, Mr. KOCH, Mr.

HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. QUIE, Mr. REES, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, and Mrs. SULLIVAN):

H.R. 9058. A bill to amend the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 to provide a more effective approach to the problem of developing and maintaining a rational relationship between building codes and related regulatory requirements and building technology in the United States, and to facilitate urgently needed cost-saving innovations in the building industry, through the establishment of an appropriate nongovernmental instrument which can make definitive technical findings, insure that the findings are made available to all sectors of the economy, public and private, and provide an effective method for encouraging and facilitating Federal, State, and local acceptance and use of such findings; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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. 9059. A bill to require community mental health centers and hospitals and other medical facilities of the Public Health Service to provide needed treatment and rehabilitation programs for drug addicts and other persons with drug abuse and other drug dependence problems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Illinois):

H.R. 9060. A bill to provide comprehensive treatment for servicemen and veterans who suffer from abuse of, or dependency on, narcotic drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 9061. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9062. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 9063. A bill to provide assistance to local school districts to maintain and establish levels of quality education in inner city schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 9064. A bill to authorize educational assistance to wives and children, and home loan benefits to wives of civilian employees of the United States who are missing or interned or captured by a hostile force in Vietnam; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 9065. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the small issue exemption from the industrial development bond provision from $5 million to $10 million; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. CARTER, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. LENNON, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. WATTS, Mr. HULL, Mr. MCMILLAN, and Mr. MILLER of Ohio):

H.R. 9066. A bill to provide that tobacco graders shall be retained in a pay status for 10 months in a calendar year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H.R. 9067. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to increase the rate of duty on certain tops, rovings, and yarns containing over 20 percent by weight of animal hair and on certain woven, knitted, or nonwoven fabrics chiefly used for paddings or interlinings in wearing apparel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCKEVITT:

H.R. 9068. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide automatic cost-of-living increases in benefits, in the earnings base, and in tax rates, to increase widow's and widower's benefits, to provide spouse's benefits at age 55, to provide benefits without regard to age for widows and widowers who are disabled, to make other improvements in benefit eligibility and benefit computation, liberalization of the earnings test, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 9069. A bill to provide for the adoption of the perpetual calendar; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN (for himself and Mr. BARRETT):

H.R. 9070. A bill to create a National Agricultural Bargaining Board, to provide standards for the qualification of associations of producers, to define the mutual obligation of handlers and associations of producers to negotiate regarding agricultural products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BARING, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DOWDY, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. FISHER, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GOODLING, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HAYS, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. KING, and Mr. MCCLOSKEY):

H.R. 9071. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax relief for homeowners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas (for himself, Mr. HUNT, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOSS, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. ST GERMAIN, and Mr. STEIGER of Arizona):

H.R. 9072. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax relief for homeowners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 9073. A bill to amend the act of June 27, 1960 (74 Stat. 220), relating to the preservation of historical and archeological data; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 9074. A bill to protect the privacy of the American home from the invasion by mail of sexually provocative material, to prohibit the use of the U.S. mails to disseminate material harmful to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 9075. A bill to discourage cruel experimentation on animals by elementary and secondary school children; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.J. Res. 698. Joint resolution. Stable Purchasing Power Resolution of 1971; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.J. Res. 699. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the tenure in office of Supreme Court Judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 700. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANDGREBE:

H.J. Res. 701. Joint resolution: Stable Purchasing Power Resolution of 1971; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.J. Res. 702. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CÓRDOVA, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H. Con. Res. 332. Concurrent resolution that the Congress hereby creates an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H. Con. Res. 333. Concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to take affirmative action to persuade the Soviet Union to revise its official policies concerning the rights of Soviet Jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASPIN:

H. Res. 473. Resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to disclosure of the results of the national nutrition survey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Res. 474. Resolution calling upon the Voice of America to broadcast in the Yiddish language to Soviet Jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H. Res. 475. Resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to disclosure of the results of the national nutrition survey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H. Res. 476. Resolution relative to releasing the national nutrition survey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

211. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, relative to the establishment of the Guam National Seashore as a national park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

212. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to the dumping of sewage in Lake Hartwell, S.C., by the Army Corps of Engineers; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 9076. A bill for the relief of Kyong Ok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKEVITT:

H.R. 9077. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Hersz Lapides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 9078. A bill for the relief of John Balaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 9079. A bill for the relief of Dorothy G. McCarty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

81. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Town Council, Herndon, Va., relative to Federal-State revenue sharing, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.